DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 337 RC 020 080

AUTHOR Pringle, Beverly A.; Rosenthal, Eric D.
TITLE An Analysis of the Costs of Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program Summer Services.
INSTITUTION Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Nov 93
CONTRACT LC-89089001
NOTE 130p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cost Effectiveness; *Delivery Systems; *Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Expenditures; *Federal Aid; Migrant Children; *Migrant Education; Migrant Programs; State Programs; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Funding Formulas; Migrant Education Program

ABSTRACT

The basic formula used by the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program to allocate funds to state agencies includes an adjustment to help defray the cost of summer services for migrant children, which can be particularly expensive. In recent years, policymakers have questioned whether the current funding formula unfairly rewards states with modest programs for large numbers of students, at the expense of states with intensive programs for fewer students. To address such concerns, program and expenditure information related to summer services was collected from 16 local sites in 6 states that have 73 percent of total migrant summer enrollments. This paper: (1) characterizes the needs of migrant children for summer services, compares the needs of migrant and nonmigrant children, compares needs of currently migrant and formerly migrant children, and examines support service needs and unmet needs; (2) describes the summer services provided, including program characteristics, delivery systems, and coordination with regular-term programs and other service providers; and (3) examines expenditures in major cost categories and variations by service delivery model and state. A central finding concerns the much lower costs of home-based services and their use to subsidize more costly campus-based instruction. Recommendations aim to encourage greater service provision to currently migrant children and to discourage the predominant use of home-based services. Appendices cover research questions, selection of local study sites and site descriptions, migrant education program funding history, amount and percent of total expenditures by cost area and site and by funding source and site, and sample per-pupil cost profile. Contains 39 references. (SV)

POLICY STUDIES ASSOCIATES, INC.
1718 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W. • SUITE 400 • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20009 • (202) 939-9780

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COSTS OF CHAPTER 1 MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM SUMMER SERVICES

Beverly A. Pringle
Eric D. Rosenthal

November 1993

Prepared for the
U.S. Department of Education
Planning and Evaluation Service
Contract LC 89089001

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The basic formula used by the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program to allocate funds to state agencies includes a "summer adjustment" that directs additional monies to states based on the number of migrant children served during the summer. The summer adjustment is intended to help defray the costs of summer services, which can be particularly expensive. Indeed, the agencies that provide summer services deliver most, if not all, of the services migrant children receive during the summer months when local schools are not in session.

In recent years, policymakers have voiced concerns about whether the current adjustment procedure results in an equitable distribution of funds to states for serving migrant children during the summer. Specifically, policymakers have questioned whether the current funding formula unfairly rewards states that serve large numbers of migrant children with modest programs, at the expense of states that serve far fewer students but with more intensive programs. To address concerns about the allocation of federal funds for students served by the Migrant Education Program, this study has collected program and expenditure information related to summer services from six state agencies and 16 local sites. This report presents the results of our analysis, which included the application of a structured approach for analyzing program costs in educational and other social service institutions.

The central finding that emerged from this analysis is that home-based services, as currently implemented, tend to cost less than campus-based services and are used, in most cases, to help subsidize the provision of more costly campus-based instruction and other enrichment experiences. The disparity is principally due to differences in (1) the number and qualifications of instructional staff and (2) the support services associated with each of the two service delivery models. Campus-based instruction is delivered in a classroom by a certified teacher and one or two instructional aides; support services typically include daily bus transportation and meals. Home-based instruction is typically delivered to individual or small groups of students by one instructional aide (only one site routinely sent certified teachers to homes); no meals or transportation are provided for children, and staff mileage costs fall substantially below the cost of pupil transportation.

To address policy concerns about equitable funding of summer school services within a broader context, this study also reviewed:

- The special educational and support service needs of migrant children served during the summer, with attention to the differing needs of currently and formerly migratory children

- The scope and nature of summer services currently offered, with a focus on the intensity of those services

The Needs of Migrant Children Served During the Summer

Currently and formerly migrant children differ most in their access to all educational and support services; migrant programs with higher proportions of currently migrant children spend greater time and energy on coordination and advocacy to ensure that these students gain access to services they need and are entitled to. While school policies confer equal access to services on all children, currently migrant children in fact have more difficulty obtaining them than do formerly migrant children. This is true for several reasons. First, formerly migrant children and their families have the advantage of being more familiar with available support services, having lived in the community longer. Currently migrant children and their parents often need intensive counseling to help them obtain appropriate social services and learn how to adapt to the local culture. Second, many small, rural districts have trouble quickly adjusting their programs to accommodate a large influx of temporary workers and their children, particularly when the migrant children's needs differ greatly from those of resident children. This is particularly true when limited English proficient migrant children move into a school attendance area that routinely employs staff who speak only English. Third, special programs often uwittingly exclude migrant children through their routine procedures. This is true, for example, of special education; services are provided only after completion of long referral and assessment processes, during which mobile migrant families may leave the area. Other programs, such as Chapter 1 and vocational education, may be full when migrant children arrive in a district or may be reluctant to fill limited participant slots with children who will likely move before the year is out.

Apart from the issue of access, currently and formerly migrant children share similar needs for assistance in basic academic skills and health-related services. According to a recent study of migrant education (Cox, Burkheimer, Curtin, Rudes, Iachan, Strang, Carlson, Zarkin, & Dean, 1992), education and health needs tend to be substantial for all migrant children, although the needs do tend to diminish the longer a child remains in one residence. Data from this study show that currently migratory children are somewhat more likely to be severely limited in English language proficiency.

Services Provided to Migrant Children During the Summer

Services provided to migrant children during the summer are generally organized around either campus- or home-based instruction. Campus-based services typically include instruction in a range of core subjects from four to seven hours a day, four to five days a week, plus daily meals, transportation to and from school, and health services. The students usually meet in a school building and are grouped by age or grade. Home-based projects generally provide instruction in one or two subject areas to children individually or in small groups, at their homes or a migrant camp. On average, children receiving instruction at home get 30 to 120 minutes of instruction each week during one or two visits from project instructors, supplemented by independent study; these students typically also receive health services. A third service type, available on a much more limited basis, involves residential camps, where selected migrant children spend one to four weeks, typically on a college campus, studying academic subjects and participating in recreational and cultural events.

Many local sites use a combination of the three service delivery models. Based on the various combinations currently in use, each model appears to have particular benefits and especially appropriate applications with certain subgroups of migrant children.

Campus-based instruction has the following advantages:

- Interaction with caring adults is maximized, as are opportunities for children to socialize with their peers in a supervised setting. Cooperative learning and other ad hoc student grouping arrangements are possible.
- Staff and students have access to instructional resources such as school libraries and audio-visual materials.
- A central location and access to buses facilitate field trips, which are especially important in helping disadvantaged as well as culturally and linguistically different children broaden their background experiences and learn in context-rich environments. On campus, the migrant project can also provide USDA-funded meals.

Home-based services have the following advantages:

- Older migrant children who cannot attend campus-based programs because they work or care for younger children can participate in home-study programs that allow them to arrange study time around their work and childcare schedules.

- Independent study nurtures students' sense of responsibility and has the potential to extend the amount of time that they are in touch with academic material during the summer.

- Home visits are a viable strategy for serving young children, particularly in areas where licensed facilities are scarce or nonexistent. They can also be ideal for involving parents in family literacy programs or teaching parenting skills, provided that scheduling ensures one or both parents are present during the instructor's home visits.

According to state and local educators, the principal purpose of sponsoring residential camp experiences for migrant children is to expose them to enriching life experiences that help broaden their sense of the world and mold their expectations for the future. Some camp experiences introduce migrant youth to the possibilities of postsecondary schooling and employment opportunities that they have never before considered--opportunities that tend to be a natural part of the lives of their more advantaged and non-migrant peers.

Coordination of summer migrant education projects with regular-term instruction, local district-sponsored summer school, year-round school schedules, and other funding streams and service providers generally reflects the characteristics of each local project's student population and the programs available in its state and local region. Coordination between summer services and regular-term instructional programs differs according to the students' migratory status and the number of school attendance areas covered by the summer project. When most students are formerly migratory children who attend district schools during the regular term, coordination is relatively straightforward. However, with greater numbers of districts involved, coordination activities become more complex. Procedures for coordinating instruction for formerly migratory children include:

- Meetings and written communications among district staff both during the spring to plan appropriate summer instruction and during the fall to update classroom teachers about progress made over the summer

- Shared staff who work in both the district regular-term schools and the migrant education project summer school

- Reviewing school records and conferring with the counselors and resource teachers who know the migrant children best

In contrast, projects serving high proportions of currently migratory children generally use more complicated coordination processes. When migrant students come from a variety of schools in different districts and states, coordination activities frequently include a combination of: (1) review of

MSRTS (Migrant Student Record Transfer System) records, (2) student surveys, (3) phone calls to home-base school staff, and (4) interstate visits by state and local staff in the receiving and home-base states.

Typically, district-sponsored summer school is only minimally accessible to migrant students. Nonetheless, migrant children sometimes attend district-sponsored summer school, due mainly to efforts by migrant education project staff to facilitate their enrollment. These efforts include:

- Arranging to waive participation fees for migrant children
- Providing transportation for migrant children
- Advocating appropriate placement of migrant children in courses offered during the summer that are needed for graduation
- Co-funding staff so that more "slots" are available for migrant children

Coordination activities also include arrangements with other agencies and funding streams, among them: (1) the U. S. Department of Agriculture to pay for meals, (2) state health care systems and local providers to attend to migrant children's medical and dental needs for free or reduced fees, (3) the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to hire migrant and other youths to work in summer migrant education projects, (4) Migrant Head Start to serve the youngest migrant children, and (5) Title XX to provide infant daycare.

The Costs of Summer Services for Migrant Children

Summer migrant education programs generate funds in direct proportion to the number of children served, an arrangement that forces projects to choose between providing nonintensive services for many or intensive services for fewer children. Some states and local projects have reached a compromise by subsidizing summer services with funds generated by year-round residency FTE counts and offering a combination of intensive and nonintensive services during the summer, with the lower cost of the latter, in effect, subsidizing the former.

Instruction and administration are the two largest expenditure categories during the summer, with personnel costs comprising the greatest share. While Migrant Education Program monies account for 67 to 99 percent of total summer expenditures at the study sites, the migrant education grants leverage substantial monetary and in-kind support from a variety of sources, including USDA,

JTPA, Basic Chapter 1, general state and local educational funds, churches, colleges and universities, and charitable community organizations. In fact, without these additional resources, some summer migrant education programs would cease to exist.

The personnel costs of providing campus-based services are higher than those for providing home-based services. Personnel costs account for the greatest variation between the two service delivery models, which is not surprising given that wages and benefits account for roughly 90 percent of all instructional costs. A certified teacher and an instructional aide staffed most of the campus-based classrooms at the study sites; a number of classrooms in one state had two aides. In contrast, home-based instruction was delivered in most cases by one instructional aide or in a few cases by one certified teacher; at only one site was home-based instruction delivered by a team of instructors. Also contributing to the lower costs of home-based instruction are a substantially larger student caseload and less instructor contact time with students. Students taught at home received 30 to 120 minutes a week for three to nine weeks compared with 3.5 to 7.5 hours a day, four or five days a week, for four to nine weeks in campus-based programs.

The nonpersonnel costs of campus-based services are also higher than those associated with home-based services. Campus-based programs typically provide daily bus transportation and meals for all students. Bringing students to one central facility usually also means that the migrant program pays rent, a part of the building utilities, and the wages of the custodial staff who clean up each day. Although home-based services incur the transportation costs of instructors driving to and from children's homes, these costs are significantly less than the cost of bus transportation for students. For example, one site reported spending about $12,904 to transport an estimated 503 children to and from school for 28 days. At the same site, home-based instruction for just over 1,000 students during an eight-week period (each child received two visits a week for eight weeks) cost approximately $3,560 in mileage reimbursement.

Another way to compare the two service delivery models is on the basis of their dollar generating capacities. On average, home-based services have a greater dollar-generating capacity than either campus-based or residential camp services relative to the amount of time children spend with an instructor. For example, at one site, 70 instructor-contact hours for each student in class on a school campus over a period of 20 days generated 26 summer FTE days and about $140. Four hours of home-based instruction (one hour a week, over a four-week period) generated the same number of FTE days per student and, consequently, had the same dollar value. In contrast, a residential camp experience at the same site that provided roughly 50 hours of contact with an instructor or camp counselor over a five-day period accrued only five FTE days per student at a value of roughly $27. These comparisons show that funds for migrant education program services are not generated and

expended on an equal dollar-for-dollar basis by service delivery model, just as they are not genertaed and expended on a dollar-for-dollar basis by school term. At those sites that offer multiple types of services, home-based instruction helps to subsidize campus-based instruction and residential camp experiences.

Policy Implications

The federal formula for distributing Sec. 1201 funds influences states' decisions about serving migrant children in two important ways. First, the current summer adjustment promotes the provision of summer services by partially compensating states for the additional costs of serving children when local district schools are not in session. Second, the summer adjustment encourages states to serve the maximum number of children during the summer, even at the risk of jeopardizing the adequacy and appropriateness of those services. Thus, two questions loom large when assessing the effects of modifications in the funding formula for distributing Sec. 1201 funds to states:

- *What types of programs will the modification encourage*? Research findings in a variety of substantive areas (e.g., effects of summer school, academic learning time, family literacy, second language learning) combined with findings from this study about the strengths and weaknesses of different service delivery models argue in favor of a funding formula that encourages states to offer a rich array of services during the summer in order to address the varied needs of the migrant children they serve.

- *Will the modification minimize the disparity among services provided across states and localities nationwide*? Summer services across states and localities differ greatly, and it appears that states with larger summer budgets, more full-time staff, and a preponderance of formerly migratory children have certain advantages (e.g., provision of a wider variety of services, simpler and less expensive coordination procedures, greater likelihood of qualified staff).

The following options for modifying the summer adjustment to more equitably distribute funds across states assume no major changes in funding trends:

1. ***Increase the funds to states that serve high proportions of currently migratory children.*** The levels of resources and effort required to adequately serve currently migrant children are substantially greater than those required to serve formerly migrant children for a number of reasons (e.g., different coordination procedures, need for induction into a community culture, language and cultural differences that staff are not trained to address). Furthermore, the severe needs of migrant children tend to moderate the longer a child remains in one residence. Additional funding for states that serve high proportions of mobile migrants during the summer would help

such states better prepare themselves for large influxes of students during the summer months, provide intensive and comprehensive services during the compressed summer service period, and follow up with students in their "sending" states during the fall.

2. ***Maintain the funding formula as is, but discourage the predominant use of home-based services through the summer adjustment.*** In order to moderate the incentive in the current summer adjustment that encourages states to maximize the use of home study and minimize the use of campus-based instruction, ED could maintain the summer adjustment as is, but modify rules and regulations to discourage the predominant use of home-based services to meet the needs of all children. This option would permit flexibility in service delivery and the growth of creative service options, and it would distribute funds somewhat more equitably.

3. ***Limit the potential of migrant children ages 5-15 to accrue the supplemental summer FTE for receipt of home-based instruction.*** Placing a cap on the proportion of time certain eligible migrant children could accrue the supplemental summer FTE for home-based service would help make the system more equitable.

4. ***Weaken the link between the provision of service and fund-raising that is currently embedded in the summer adjustment.*** The current summer adjustment encourages migrant educators to make educational decisions on the basis of fund-raising concerns (because only those children who receive services during the summer accrue the supplemental summer FTE that generates funds for a state). In order to weaken this incentive, ED could increase by some factor (e.g., double) the residency count of localities providing campus-based services, whatever their duration, for a period equal to the national average length of campus-based programs. This option retains the incentive to identify, recruit, and serve migrant children during the summer and adds an incentive to serve children with campus-based services. While it is possible that fewer children would be served as a result of this change, it is likely that services would be better targeted on the most needy children.

Regardless of the option selected for modifying the summer adjustment, two additional suggestions merit consideration. First, establishing a minimum annual funding level for all states that serve migrant children would help ensure continuity of program development and maintenance throughout the year. Second, while current national funding levels prevail, there are serious negative consequences attached to making a national formula-based distinction between intensive (campus-based) and nonintensive (home-based) instruction. A change now could close off an avenue that is being used locally as a way of acquiring funds to support a rich mix of summer services in some communities.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

I. INTRODUCTION: STUDYING THE COSTS OF SUMMER SERVICES FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

Unique among federal programs, migrant education challenges both the U.S. Department of Education (ED) and state educational agencies (SEAs), through which the program is administered, to mobilize resources each year for the purpose of educating the children of a transient population. The purpose of this study, An Analysis of Migrant Education Program Summer School Costs, is to (1) characterize the needs of migrant children for summer school services, (2) describe the services provided to migrant children during the summer and the costs of providing those services, and (3) discuss options for more adequately and equitably funding migrant summer school services, especially for currently migrant children.

Context for This Study

The statutory mission of the national Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program is twofold: (1) to serve the unique needs of migrant children--who travel with their families in search of employment--whenever and wherever they settle during the annual labor cycle, and (2) to help children who have ceased to migrate overcome the vestigial barriers to educational achievement imposed by their previously mobile lifestyle. Summer school is widely regarded as a key means to address this dual undertaking. Migrant agricultural workers and their families settle temporarily during the growing season, making the summer months an ideal time for making up missed schoolwork or redressing accumulated learning gaps. In fact, summer migrant education programs are widespread; 47 states and the District of Columbia offered summer services to migrant children in 1991 (Henderson, Daft, Yen, & Gutmann, 1993).

The services furnished to migrant children during summer months differ fundamentally from regular-term services. Instead of enhancing a school district's basic education program, agencies that serve migrant children during the summer provide most, if not all, the services that migrant children receive during those periods. Indeed, summer migrant education programs often provide instruction in a full range of academic subjects as well as transportation, meals, and some health services (Marks, 1987).

In 1978, Congress acknowledged the need for summer migrant education programs and the states' reluctance to operate them:

> ...the lack of stability in the average migrant child's educational process speaks for the necessity of summer programs, but few States have implemented these programs due to their higher costs (U.S. Congress, 1978, p. 40).

To promote adequate summer services for migrant children, Congress directed the Commissioner of Education to compensate states for the additional costs of operating summer programs by adjusting the basis of states' annual allocations--the full-time equivalent (FTE) count of eligible children residing in each state[1]:

> ...In determining the full-time equivalent number of migratory children who are in a State during the summer months, the Commissioner shall adjust the number so determined to take into account the special needs of those children for summer programs and the additional costs of operating such programs during the summer (Sec. 141[b]).

As directed, the U.S. Office of Education (now the Department of Education, or ED) adjusted the federal formula in order to steer additional funds to states providing summer services. It did so by increasing the FTE number of migrant children residing in a state according to the number of migrant children enrolled in summer school. This "summer adjustment" allowed a state to accrue 1.0 FTE for each 109 days of migrant student enrollment in a summer education program, making one day of summer school enrollment roughly equivalent to the funding power of three days of residence in the state during the year.[2] The new "summer FTE" supplemented the "residency FTE" generated by all identified, eligible migrant children residing in a state at any time of the year. It essentially double counted children served during the summer and thus offset (to some unknown degree) the additional costs of providing services to migrant children during the summer. This summer adjustment made no distinction among summer projects by type, quality, or cost of services. Although ED has had authority to redesign the summer adjustment at any time since its inception, the adjustment went unchallenged until 1989 and endures to date.

---

[1] The allocation process uses the FTE number, rather than the absolute number of migrant children, to accommodate the movement of eligible children among states. Thus, a migrant child who resides in a given state for six months during a particular year counts as 0.5 FTE for that state.

[2] The 109 days run from May 15 through August 31, covering the maximum span of time during which summer services might be provided. The advent of year-round schools presents a new dilemma for those seeking a more equitable summer adjustment, which was intended to provide supplemental funds for programs operating when local schools are not in session. The present summer adjustment assumes that the only time local schools are not in session (other than during traditional holiday recesses) is during the summer months. It does not account for the briefer and more frequent intersessions of year-round school schedules.

In January 1989, ED issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to change the regulations governing the Migrant Education Program. The NPRM included a major change in the formula for distributing Migrant Education Program funds to states: modification in the summer adjustment. The proposed change arose from two concerns. First, as noted in the Supplemental Information to the NPRM, ED staff perceived that the current summer adjustment might unfairly reward states that serve large numbers of migrant children with modest summer programs at the expense of states that serve far fewer migrant children but implement intensive programs. Second, federal staff were aware that some summer school projects generated program funds for their states in excess of their actual costs (Federal Register, Vol. 54, No. 203, October 23, 1989, p. 43240).

To address these concerns, the NPRM proposed a two-tier summer adjustment that would distinguish among summer school programs by intensity of instruction. It defined an intensive instructional program as "one that is operated for at least three hours per day or 15 hours per week" (Migrant Education Program Proposed Rules, 34 CFR, Part 201, Subsec. 201.20[a]). According to the proposed modification, migrant children enrolled in an intensive program would continue to generate 1.0 FTE for every 109 days of participation; however, those enrolled in "any other summer school program of instruction" would generate 0.5 FTE for every 109 days of participation.

The Secretary's proposal to adopt a two-tier summer adjustment sparked a heated debate on how and whether to change the existing summer adjustment, as ED's synopsis of the varied public comment reveals:

> Those favoring the proposal cited its improvement over the current formula that does not address in any manner the differences in program cost or intensity of summer school programs operated throughout the country. However, many commenters felt that while its thrust was correct, the [proposed modification] was far too weak. . . . Many commenters, particularly those from 'receiving' States whose State programs emphasized summer programs, argued that the single supplemental FTE credit for every 109 days of enrollment between May 15 and August 31 generated too little additional funding to meet the costs of operating intensive summer projects. . . . On the other hand, the Secretary received many comments from those opposing [the proposed modification]. Commenters argued that the proposal would discourage innovative instruction and drastically reduce the number of migratory children whom summer programs would be able to reach. . . . In keeping with the service priorities in section 1202(b) of the Act that favor programs and services for currently migratory children, many commenters stressed the failure of both the current formula and the proposed [summer adjustment] to focus on the need for increasing the levels and proportion of funding for programs designed to meet the needs of those children (Federal Register, Vol. 54, No. 203, October 23, 1989, p. 43239).

Commenters also exhorted ED to consider fully all possible effects of any change in the summer adjustment before adopting it. Accordingly, ED withdrew its proposal, but announced in the preamble to the final regulations its intent to study the issue further and to propose yet another formula adjustment that would better accommodate the needs of currently migratory children for summer school services and the costs of addressing them (Federal Register, Vol. 54, No. 203, October 23, 1989, p. 43221).

To study and redesign the summer adjustment of the federal funding formula, ED hired Policy Studies Associates to review three aspects of the summer migrant education program:

- The special educational and support service needs of migrant children served during the summer, with attention to the differing needs of currently and formerly migratory children;
- The current scope and nature of summer services, with a focus on the intensity of those services; and
- The costs of providing summer services to migrant children.

ED specified questions to be addressed within each of the three areas (Appendix A). To help answer these questions and to inform the redesign of the summer adjustment, PSA developed an index of the relative costs of delivering various services to migrant children during the summer months. Using this cost index, ED can assess options for more adequately and equitably distributing program funds in order to help states better respond to the unique needs of migrant children for summer services.

Study Design and Research Methods

The major purpose of this study was to address, through case studies and a cost analysis of local migrant education project expenditures, questions about the three topics identified earlier. The secondary purpose was to develop options for more adequately and equitably distributing federal migrant education funds to states, considering the special needs of currently migratory children for summer services and the costs of providing these services. Our overall goal was to identify, describe, and account for the costs of all services provided to migrant children during the summer migrant education project at each of 16 study sites, regardless of funding source or service provider.

The study questions required us to collect information and opinions from multiple sources. We began by reviewing background materials, including prior studies of the Migrant Education

Program, relevant legislation, regulations, congressional hearing records, and data from the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS). We also examined files maintained by ED's Office of Migrant Education that contain information on each state's migrant education program.

To supplement this background information and to identify the full range of issues related to ED's concerns about the quality and costs of summer services, we spoke with a number of informed individuals, including MSRTS staff and members of the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) executive committee and subcommittees. We conducted group interviews with state directors of migrant education who were gathered in Virginia and California for program-related technical assistance training. We also talked on several occasions with ED staff and a consultant to the National Commission on Migrant Education about the nature and history of the funding concerns under investigation.

Site Selection

Based on our document reviews and guidance from the expert interviewees, we nominated six states for site visits: California, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Utah. Several principles guided the state selection process. Of the 46 states (and the District of Columbia) that provided migrant education services in the summer of 1990, we chose six states that represented a combined total of 73 percent (39,386) of the summer FTEs nationwide (53,922). The selected states also represent a wide range in terms of: (1) location in the three main migrant streams, (2) total number of summer subgrants, (3) percent of FTEs generated by currently migratory children, and (4) predominant service delivery model. Table 1 illustrates these ranges across the selected states.

Table 1

Criteria for Selecting States

State	Migrant Stream	No. of Summer Subgrants	% Currently FTE	Service Delivery Model
California	Western	18	29	home and campus
Georgia	Eastern	4	42	home and campus
Michigan	Central	41	72	home and campus
Minnesota	Central	14	96	campus
New York	Eastern	12	31	home and campus
Utah	Western	10	39	campus

NOTE: For convenience, we distinguish service delivery models in this table by location of instruction. However, the models are actually more complex than that. Home-based projects generally provide instruction in one or two subject areas, to children individually or in small groups, at their homes or in a migrant camp. On average, children served by home-based projects receive one-half to two hours of instruction each week during one or two visits from migrant project instructors. The children are then expected to spend a certain number of hours each week studying independently. Campus-based programs look more like regular school programs; they provide instruction in a range of core subjects from four to seven hours a day, four to five days a week. Students attending campus-based projects usually meet in a school building and are grouped by age or grade.

SOURCE: Based on data for the 1989 summer term, obtained from MSRTS (1991).

We asked the migrant education directors of the six states to nominate operating agencies, representing a variety of project designs, for site visits.[3] From their nominations we selected 16 sites that are diverse in terms of ten variables, including four that emerged out of preliminary data from the Descriptive Study of the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program conducted by the Research Triangle Institute (Cox, Burkheimer, Curtin, Rudes, Iach[illegible], Strang, Carlson, Zarkin, & Dean, 1992):

[3] The varied fiscal and administrative structures of the migrant education program within the six states under investigation, along with the level of detail required by our study design, necessitated some sampling of sites within operating agencies. We also found the terms of reference inconsistent across states once we went beyond the operating agency. Consequently, for convenience and confidentiality, we will use the term "site" throughout this report to refer to all 16 locales we studied and will note their fiscal and administrative details as appropriate. Appendix B contains a more complete discussion of our selection of local sites.

1. Administrative/funding structure (e.g., single school district, state regional office)
2. Number of participants
3. Grades served
4. Migratory status of participants (i.e., majority currently or formerly)
5. Total number of service days in the summer term
6. Number of hours of service per week during the summer term
7. Instruction provided (e.g., math, language arts)
8. Support services provided (e.g., health, counseling)
9. Other compensatory services available
10. Location of service delivery (i.e., home-, camp-, or campus-based)

Site Visits

We conducted site visits from May to July 1991, and we focused our data collection on the previous year's (1990) summer program in order to ascertain actual expenditures rather than projected or budgeted figures. Using detailed instruments and collection procedures designed to be uniform across sites, we collected extensive descriptive (e.g., student-teacher contact hours, personnel qualifications) and expenditure (e.g., wage and benefit rates, transportation costs) data on personnel and nonpersonnel resources, regardless of funding source, used to provide services at each site.

During a typical visit, two study-team members spent a half-day at the SEA to collect written materials and meet with the state migrant education program director and, in most cases, the finance manager. The two study-team members then spent one or two days at each site collecting background documents and interviewing personnel. At the site, both study-team members met with the migrant program coordinator, the finance manager, and other appropriate program personnel, often including the principal. In those cases where we sampled from the sites constituting one operating agency, study staff spent part of the day at the operating agency and part of the time at the site, depending on the location of pertinent documents and knowledgeable personnel. Follow-up communications included telephone calls and written correspondence to individuals and agencies that provided any other services or materials to migrant children at the study sites on a contract or fee-for-service basis (e.g., Portable Assisted Study Sequence materials, identification and recruitment).

Analysis

The expenditure data collected on site formed the basis of an operational cost model for summer migrant education services. In developing the cost model we used the approach embodied in

the AEFP/RCM cost analysis system,[4] which provides a structured approach to program cost analysis in educational and other social service institutions. Our data collection procedures were designed and implemented to facilitate application of this model. The AEFP/RCM system involves three steps:

1. Disaggregating and listing the instructional and related service activities
2. Determining the specific personnel and nonpersonnel resources used in each service activity
3. Attaching prices to each of these resources to determine specific program costs

Using this system, we assigned average compensation rates to all personnel by job category in order to examine costs exclusive of differences in wage and benefit rates across sites. We then estimated the total and per pupil costs of providing all services at each site by calculating costs for instruction, administration, recruitment and outreach, and all other support services by three types of service delivery models (i.e., home-based, school campus-based, or residential camp). Information gathered during interviews supplied explanations and elaborations for the cost data.

We note that findings from this study are limited because of small sample sizes. The data are not statistically representative: they cannot be aggregated to indicate nationwide tendencies; percentages cannot be determined from combining data elements across sites; and correlations cannot be calculated. Further, it was beyond the scope of this study to collect and analyze effectiveness data. Therefore, we do not suggest that cost is related to program effectiveness. However, we believe the data can be used reliably to reflect differences and similarities among local summer school operations, and the information in this report can add to policy discussions.

[4] The AEFP/RCM system was developed by Jay G. Chambers and Thomas B. Parrish, the principal cost analysis researchers at the American Institutes for Research (AIR), who assisted with this study. AEFP is an acronym for Associates for Education Finance and Planning, which is the company currently holding rights for use of the AEFP/RCM computer simulation model.

A Brief Overview of the Migrant Education Program

Enacted in 1966, P.L. 89-750 amended Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize a national assistance program for children of migratory agricultural workers; subsequent legislation in 1974 (P.L. 93-380) extended program benefits to children of migratory fishers. Through this legislation, Congress acknowledged the challenging conditions that face migrant children throughout their school careers. Recently, a group of ethnographers catalogued such conditions as characteristics of the "culture of migrancy" (Prewitt Diaz, Trotter, & Rivera, 1990):

- As a result of their mobile lifestyle, migrant children experience a high degree of unpredictability in all aspects of their lives, including education.
- In moving from district to district and state to state, migrant children are socially isolated, even from the communities in which they live.
- Because moving from place to place is expensive and the agricultural season unpredictable, migrant children sometimes go without adequate food, clothing, or health services.
- The agricultural cycle that governs the movement of migrant families cross-cuts the school year. Consequently, many migrant children attend a number of schools irregularly and, as a result, experience instructional discontinuity.
- Migrants, especially those who come from linguistically and culturally different backgrounds, have trouble dealing with the social institutions of the mainstream culture, including schools, social service agencies, and health care providers.
- Older migrant children often miss school to care for younger children so that both parents can work.
- Many school administrators and teachers view migrant children as nonresidents and, as a result, do not expend the extra effort often needed to find, enroll, and retain them in school.
- Migrant children assume many adult responsibilities at younger ages than their non-migrant peers; making decisions to continue or drop out of school are among them.

The Migrant Education Program is currently authorized under Chapter 1 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford

Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments (P.L. 100-297).[5] It provides grants under Sec. 1201 (formerly Sec. 141) to SEAs for "programs and projects . . . which are designed to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers (including migratory agricultural dairy workers) or of migratory fishermen, and to coordinate such programs and projects with similar programs and projects in other states, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children" (Sec. 1202).

Program Participants

Two types of children are eligible for services under the program: "currently migratory children" and "formerly migratory children." A "currently migratory child" is one--

> (1) whose parent or guardian is a migratory agricultural worker or a migratory fisher; and (2) who has moved within the past 12 months from one school district to another--or, in a state that is comprised of a single school district, has moved from one school administrative area to another--to enable the child, the child's guardian, or a member of the child's immediate family to obtain temporary or seasonal employment in an agricultural or fishing activity. This definition includes a child who has been eligible to be served under the requirements in the preceding sentence, and who, without the parent or guardian, has continued to migrate annually to enable him or her to secure temporary or seasonal employment in an agricultural or fishing activity. This definition also includes children of migratory fishermen, if these children reside in a school district of more than 18,000 square miles and migrate a distance of 20 miles or more to temporary residences to engage in fishing activity (34 CFR, Part 201, Subsec. 201.3, Migrant Education Program).

A "formerly migratory child" is a child who (1) was eligible to be counted and served as a currently migratory child within the past five years, but is not now a currently migratory child; and (2) has the concurrence of his or her parent or guardian to continue to be considered a migratory child.

---

[5] Among several changes effected by the enactment of the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments was an expansion in the age range--from 5-17 years to 3-21 years--of migrant children who generate funds for states operating migrant education programs.

Procedures for Distributing Sec. 1201 Funds

Over $280 million was spent in 1990 to serve an estimated 556,251 FTE migrant children nationwide.[6] Of these, approximately 11 percent or 59,446 were supplemental summer FTEs generated by migrant children attending summer programs (MSRTS, 1991). ED allocates approximately 97 percent of each annual appropriation directly to the states (including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and, beginning in 1989, the Northern Mariana Islands) through Sec. 1201 grants. California, Florida, and Texas together receive about 62 percent of the Sec. 1201 funds because of their large agricultural sectors and migrant populations (U.S. Department of Education, 1991a). The remaining 3 percent of the annual appropriation pays for "Coordination of Migrant Education Activities," or Sec. 1203 grants (Table 2).

Table 2

Migrant Education Program Expenditures in FY 1988-1990

	1988	1989	1990
State Grants (Sec. 1201)	$260,856,500	$263,436,000	$274,029,098
Coordination (Sec. 1203)	$ 8,172,500	$ 8,264,000	$ 8,414,000
TOTAL	$269,029,000	$271,700,000	$282,444,098

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education. (1990b). Justifications of Appropriation Estimates for Committees on Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1990, Volume I. Washington, DC: Author, p. 34.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education.

[6] Although the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments provide for full funding of the migrant education program (Sec. 1403, Part E), annual appropriations have fallen short of the authorized funding levels for many years. In fact, since 1980, when Congress began specifying the dollar amount to be appropriated for migrant education, appropriations have dropped further below the full funding level each year, falling to about 33 percent in 1990 (Rivera, 1990). As a result, ED has ratably reduced state allocations every year since 1980 in order to scale Sec. 1201 grants down to the appropriated amount. The funding shortfalls have created a tension among states as they compete in a zero-sum game of FTE accrual to garner maximum shares of the appropriation.

State Grants

ED allocates Sec. 1201 funds to states through a statutory formula (Figure 1) based on (1) the number of FTE migrant children aged 3 through 21 residing in each state and (2) each state's average per-pupil expenditure (PPE). The total FTE count is adjusted to account for the additional costs of running summer programs, although each state's annual allocation is a lump sum, not subdivided by school term (Table 3). MSRTS supplies ED with the annual FTE counts;[7] the National Center for Education Statistics furnishes the states' PPEs.[8]

Figure 1

Federal Formula for Allocating Sec. 1201 Funds to States

$$X = 0.4 \times PPE\ (A + B + C)$$

X =	state allocation
0.4 x PPE =	40 percent of state's per pupil expenditure (See footnote 8.)
A =	number of eligible migrant children residing in the state full time (based on 365 days)
B =	FTE of eligible migrant children residing in the state part time (based on 365 days), including the summer months
C =	FTE of eligible migrant children participating in a summer migrant education program (based on 109 days); also known as the "summer adjustment"

[7] The MSRTS, funded through a contract with the Arkansas Department of Education, is a computerized data base that contains demographic, health, and educational information on migrant children. Providing FTE counts to ED became a principal function of the MSRTS in 1974 when P.L. 93-380 authorized the Commissioner to use FTE counts generated by the MSRTS to determine state grant amounts. However, the original purpose of the MSRTS was, and continues to be, to provide student-specific information for educators and other staff serving migrant children.

[8] A state's PPE is the average amount of state and local funds expended annually on free public education for children in prekindergarten through grade 12 (Rivera, 1990). To mitigate the effects of particularly high or low state PPEs, the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380) introduced a ceiling and a floor for PPEs used to calculate state allocations. Since then, no state's allocation has been based on a PPE of more than 120 percent or less than 80 percent of the national average PPE. In 1990 the floor was used to determine 12 states' allocations; the ceiling was used to determine 10.

Subgrants

Designated as a "state agency" program, Chapter 1 migrant education is unlike the Chapter 1 basic grants program which allocates funds directly to local school districts. ED allocates Sec. 1201 funds to state agencies only; states have the option of providing services directly to eligible children or making subgrants to "operating agencies," which may be school districts or other public or nonprofit private agencies. In practice, most program services are delivered through SEA subgrants to operating agencies, the most common being the local school district (Table 4).

Current federal regulations require that subgrants to operating agencies should be based on: (1) the total number of children to be served; (2) the nature, scope, and cost of the proposed projects; (3) the availability of funds and services from other sources; and (4) any other relevant criteria developed by the SEA (34 CFR, Part 201, Subsection 201.25[c], Migrant Education Program).[9] However, the program regulations reflect a singular concern for currently migrant children by additionally requiring states to ensure that:

> . . . the amount of each subgrant to be awarded will be at least enough to pay the costs of projects designed to meet the unmet special educational needs of all significant concentrations of currently migratory children residing in the areas the [local educational agency] serves (34 CFR, Part 201, Subsec. 201.25 [b], Migrant Education Program).

[9] Marks (1987) reported that most of the six states she studied, despite federal regulations to do otherwise, based subgrant amounts solely on the basis of FTE numbers of eligible migrant children. She noted, however, that two of the states, Florida and Texas, were modifying their subgrant procedures to account for other factors--children's migratory status and local per pupil expenditures, respectively.

Table 3

Sec. 1201 Allocations for 1990-91, by State

State	Amount	State	Amount
Alabama	$1,915,186	Nevada	$ 630,836
Alaska	7,515,397	New Hampshire	123,394
Arizona	7,041,283	New Jersey	1,544,047
Arkansas	4,235,900	New Mexico	1,306,003
California	93,155,567	New York	6,394,210
Colorado	2,370,032	North Carolina	2,781,691
Connecticut	2,010,054	North Dakota	525,885
Delaware	585,558	Ohio	1,342,827
Florida	23,533,882	Oklahoma	976,989
Georgia	2,435,322	Oregon	8,348,055
Hawaii	0	Pennsylvania	3,028,394
Idaho	3,372,527	Rhode Island	157,506
Illinois	1,949,448	South Carolina	252,391
Indiana	1,140,089	South Dakota	60,953
Iowa	218,799	Tennessee	185,375
Kansas	3,783,236	Texas	43,296,783
Kentucky	2,175,756	Utah	849,971
Louisiana	3,177,875	Vermont	763,325
Maine	3,434,748	Virginia	414,508
Maryland	376,447	Washington	12,180,915
Massachusetts	4,591,267	West Virginia	41,734
Michigan	10,499,948	Wisconsin	812,759
Minnesota	2,057,837	Wyoming	238,961
Mississippi	1,914,299	Dist. of Col.	87,137
Missouri	725,904	Puerto Rico	2,866,255
Montana	290,523	No. Marianas	15,905
Nebraska	340,406	TOTAL	$274,029,098

NOTE: Because the Migrant Education Program is forward funded, the funds appropriated as part of the FY 1990 budget generally supported migrant education programs during the 1990-91 school year (FY 1990 funds were available for obligation from July 1, 1990 until September 30, 1991). Conversely, the estimated number of migrant children to be served with 1990 budget funds was based on FTE counts accrued during the 1989 calendar year (January 1 to December 31).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education.

Table 4

Distribution of Chapter 1 Migrant Subgrants in 1988-89, by Type of Agency Receiving the Subgrant

Agency Type	Number of Reported Subgrants	Percent of Reported Subgrants	Percent of Reported Subgrant Dollars
Public School District	1,125	90	87
Institutions	5	0	2
Intermediate Agencies	65	5	8
State Agencies	20	2	1
Colleges & Universities	13	1	1
Other	23	2	1
Total	1,251	100	100

NOTE: Based on 49 States and the District of Columbia. Hawaii did not participate in the program.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. (1991a). Distribution of state-administered education funds, Fourteenth annual report. Washington, DC: Author.

Targeting Program Services

When applying for funds to provide services to migrant children, SEAs and operating agencies must make a number of critical decisions about targeting program services which, according to federal regulation, are to be based on an annual assessment of the needs of eligible migrant children who reside or are expected to reside in the state (34 CFR, Part 201, Migrant Education Program). Two of the key decisions are closely linked: (1) when to provide migrant education program services--during the regular school term, the summer term, or both--and (2) in which locations across the state. The annual needs assessment informs these decisions by helping the SEA and operating agencies determine when substantial concentrations of migrant children will likely reside in specific regions of the state and what educational and support services they are likely to need. The most current program participation data, shown below in Table 5, indicate that 87 percent of the migrant students served in 1990-91 received services during the regular school term. Just over

34 percent received services during the summer term, and 21 percent receive services during both terms.

Table 5

Migrant Education Program Participation by Term, 1990-91

Regular Term Participation	Summer Term Participation	Total Unduplicated Participation
381,345	149,628	437,363

NOTE: Of the 49 states that participate in the MEP (Hawaii does not), the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, five states (Montana, Nebraska, Rhode Island, Utah, Wyoming) did not offer a regular-term program in 1990-91; three (Nevada, New Hampshire, and Puerto Rico) did not offer a 1991 summer-term program.

SOURCE: Henderson, A., Daft, J., Yen, C., & Gutmann, B. (1993). A summary of state Chapter 1 migrant education program participation and achievement information, 1990-91. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc..

A second targeting decision is which children to serve. With a finite resource base that is shrinking relative to the number of eligible children, SEAs and operating agencies must make tough choices about targeting program services. Congress offered some guidance in the authorizing legislation by directing that currently migratory children be given priority in the consideration of programs and activities; ED underscored the service priority in regulations that govern the determination of subgrant amounts. However, while acknowledging this priority, state directors of migrant education point out that formerly migratory children must not be overlooked. Indeed, the state directors have argued vehemently that formerly and currently migrant children suffer similar levels of educational disadvantagement. Citing comparative data on grade placement, dropout rates, language proficiency, and other indicators of educational need in a report to Congress, NASDME argued that "the needs of formerly migratory children are only marginally less severe than those of currently migratory children" and "decidedly greater than those of typical non-Chapter 1 eligibles" (NASDME, 1989, p. 1). Fueling the debate are recent findings from the Descriptive Study of the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program (Cox et al., 1992) that "the educational and related services needs of formerly migratory students decrease the longer they are settled out (p. iv). The researchers add, however, that formerly migratory children have continuing special needs that are greater than

those of non-migrants. Nonetheless, recent summaries of student participation showing that 49 percent of the migrant children served in 1989-90 and 50 percent of those served in 1990-91 were formerly migratory (Henderson et al., 1993), raise questions about the Migrant Education Program's effectiveness in targeting resources on the children for whom the program was intended.[10]

[10] The House Committee on Appropriations--in a report on the 1990 Appropriations Bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies (Report 101-172 accompanying H.R. 2990)-- asked ED to review the number of formerly migratory students served by the migrant program and the policy implications of those data. In response, ED submitted a brief report to the committee, stating that "no data exist from which to determine if eligible formerly migratory children in recent years have been: (1) as educationally disadvantaged as currently migratory children, or (2) significantly more disadvantaged than other children receiving services under the basic Chapter 1 program." However, ED's report continued, a reanalysis of data from the 1981 study of the migrant education program, conducted by Research Triangle Institute (Cameron, 1981), suggested that "there appear to be few differences in level of academic achievement between formerly and currently migrant children," and "migrant children are roughly equivalent in terms of academic achievement to children who participate in the regular Chapter 1 program."

II. MIGRANT CHILDREN'S NEED FOR SUMMER SCHOOL SERVICES

Projects that serve migrant children during the summer face a daunting challenge. The administrators, teachers, aides, recruiters, and outreach workers who staff these projects must cope with communities hostile to their mission to serve temporary residents (migrant children), limited resources and planning time, and unpredictable numbers of students with profound and diverse learning needs who come and go on erratic schedules. Providing effective services under these conditions is difficult. By way of guidance, federal regulations require states and operating agencies to conduct an annual assessment of the population's needs and build their programs based on the findings. This annual assessment addresses both the educational and support service needs of eligible migrant children. Before we present our findings on needs, however, we discuss the issue of access to all educational services for migrant children; access to services is where currently and formerly migrant children differ most.

Access to Educational and Support Services

One reason summer projects are so vital for migrant children is that many mobile migrants do not receive a full 180 days of instruction from September to June. However, an additional ramification of mobility is that currently migrant children do not always have full access to special services such as Chapter 1 and special education during the school year. Indeed, Baca and Harris (1988) found in their study of migrant exceptional children that the greatest impediment to providing equal access to an appropriate education is the population's mobility. Confounding the situation further is the fact that Chapter 1 and special education programs frequently do not adequately accommodate culturally and linguistically different children. Children placed in special programs with staff that neither know nor are sensitive to their language or culture cannot reap the programs' intended benefits.

Almost without exception, state directors and project coordinators told us that, as a matter of policy, migrant children have the same access to special services as do all disadvantaged children. However, most agreed that in practice, migrant children often have less access to these programs than other children. Special education is one example given by many. The process of referring and properly assessing children for special education placement is quite time-consuming. Before it is completed, many migrant children have moved on to a different state or district, never having received services and often not having completed the assessment. Furthermore, the LEP status of

many migrant children requires specially trained staff for proper assessment--staff that few districts routinely employ. According to one director, migrants are often wrongly suspected of needing special education simply because of their difficulty with English. The risk of misclassification is particularly high in districts that lack trained bilingual staff.

In many cases, currently migrant children have limited access to Chapter 1 basic grant program services, largely because of their mobility. One local coordinator said that migrant children who receive Chapter 1 services in the fall may leave the district for a matter of months, and return in the spring to find their "slots" taken by other needy students. Other coordinators said that migrants' access to Chapter 1 depends on when they first arrive in the district and whether, for example, eligibility assessment has already been completed for the year. Once again, if a migrant child is LEP or non-English speaking, his or her chances of even being considered for Chapter 1 services are dramatically reduced. Strang and Carlson (1991) found in their study of Chapter 1 services provided to LEP students that very few states "make more than modest efforts to inform their districts that LEP students may be served in Chapter 1" (p. iii). The researchers further reported that coordination between Chapter 1 and language services for LEP students is rare at the state level because the two programs exist separately with different histories and agendas.

Other areas of special services were mentioned by state directors and local coordinators with less frequency. A few said that migrant children in their area have difficulty gaining access to vocational education services. One local coordinator noted that the district is unlikely to make vocational education available to migrant children because enrollment in the program is extremely limited and students must be able to participate for nine consecutive months. While no one claimed that a policy exists to limit migrants' access to gifted and talented programs, one coordinator admitted that, because so many migrant children are below average in basic skills achievement, other migrants are overlooked for these programs.

Educational Needs

According to the results of statewide needs assessments and the observations of local coordinators, migrant children generally lack basic skills in reading, math, and oral language.

Comparing the Educational Needs of Migratory and Non-migratory Children

While basic skills deficiencies are common among disadvantaged students, the educational needs of migrant children can be particularly severe because of irregular schooling. Mobile migrant children who travel between September and June experience a truncated version of the regular 180-day school term. Summer projects help migrant children make up for this lost instructional time.

Limited English proficiency shapes the educational needs of many migrant children in a profound way. Given that verbal communication is the currency of the teaching-learning exchange, inadequate language skills affect all aspects of a child's education. According to a statewide evaluation, 60 percent of the migrant children served in California are limited English proficient (LEP), and in a given summer project, the percentage of LEP students served can be significantly higher: at one study site in California, for example, only 12 percent of the participating students spoke English fluently. Often citing the large numbers of LEP students attending their summer projects, local coordinators without exception told us that developing written and oral language skills is a top priority. Some coordinators identified oral language development as particularly critical, because many students lack communicative competence in two languages--English and Spanish.

In addition to discussing this need for language proficiency, almost every local coordinator named reading and math as the principal subjects that migrant children need to study during the summer. Statewide needs assessments in most of the states we visited showed migrant children performing below average in all three basic skills areas. For example, the July 1990 California performance report for migrant students revealed that migrants in grades 1-12 who were tested in English averaged percentile scores of 23 in reading, 37 in math, and 28 in language on standardized tests. A comparative study in Georgia indicated that migrant children generally performed 20 to 30 percentile points below statewide averages on standardized tests (Table 6). Utah's 1990 Migrant Education Annual Summer Evaluation Report also showed migrant students to be deficient in basic academic skills, scoring at about the 35th percentile in reading and slightly higher in mathematics.

Beyond this general deficiency in basic skills, migrant children have a host of other educational needs. Among the specific areas frequently mentioned by local and state educators are pre-kindergarten readiness, motivation, self-confidence, problem-solving skills, and familiarity or comfort with educational technology, particularly computers. Local coordinators of projects serving adolescents and young adults see great need for such students to accrue credits for graduation and explore their career options beyond migrant labor. Migrant youth especially need guidance to recognize the value of a high school diploma as a prerequisite for further schooling and most employment options. One local coordinator observed that children of migrant workers often do not

receive the career guidance from friends, family, and school staff members that benefits many non-migrant youth.

Table 6

Migrant Performance Compared to State Averages in Georgia, 1989

	Percentile Ranks by Grade and Student Group			
Subject	**2nd Grade Mig/Avg**	**4th Grade Mig/Avg**	**7th Grade Mig/Avg**	**9th Grade Mig/Avg**
Reading	30/63	25/54	27/51	24/52
Language	53/73	35/62	36/55	24/57
Math	55/74	39/64	33/55	19/50

NOTE: First number is the average percentile score of migrant students receiving instructional services in Georgia. Second number is the average of all students in the state.

The Iowa Test of Basic Skills is administered in grades 2, 4, and 7; The Test of Achievement and Proficiency is administered in grade 9.

SOURCE: State of Georgia Migrant Program Evaluation, FY 1989. Exhibit II.

Comparing the Educational Needs of Currently and Formerly Migratory Children

According to both state and local migrant educators, currently and formerly migratory children generally share similar educational needs, with the degree of language facility posing the one obvious exception: currently migratory children are often less proficient in English. However, currently migrant children exact greater expenditures from local migrant education projects due to the time and resources required to "hook up" these students to the services they need, on short notice and often against countervailing forces.

Migrant educators broadened the context for our discussion of educational needs by talking about the interaction between the needs of currently migratory children and the resource of schools and districts they enter during the spring and summer. One state director pointed out that when

mobile migrants converge for a relatively short period of time on a small rural school already overburdened with the needs of a poor non-migrant population, local response is understandably limited. Such examples highlight the disadvantage for many receiving states: it can be far more difficult to start up and three months later wind down a set of services that do not exist year-round (e.g., ESL, preschool) than to ratchet up existing programs for the summer influx of migrant children. In another state, one local coordinator observed that currently migratory children who pour into his state each spring get less than the best teachers have to offer, suggesting, "Mobile migrants are walking into a hostile environment. Teachers have used their bag of tricks during the year and they have little energy left."

Aside from the issue of access, most state directors, as well as some local project coordinators, said that there is no difference between the educational needs of currently and formerly migratory children. Among the coordinators who perceived a difference between currently and formerly migratory children, most expressed it in terms of variation in the degree of need, not in the type. Specifically, a number of local coordinators said that while both groups of children require attention to English language development, currently migrant students tend to be less proficient users of English than formerly migrant students. One coordinator stated that currently migratory children in the summer project generally require two to three times more tutoring in English. Another said that because there is great disparity in the language proficiency of currently and formerly migratory children, currently migratory children tend to fall behind formerly migratory children in all subject areas.

A few coordinators pointed to greater differences between the groups. One state director observed that currently migratory children are generally more lacking in self-confidence and that their greatest need is often someone to "hold their hand" and support them in the learning process. Formerly migratory children, he said, do not need this degree of "hand holding" and instead often need encouragement and opportunities to pursue more academically challenging programs. At the local level as well, a few coordinators agreed that currently and formerly migratory children differ in terms of their self-image and readiness to learn, arguing that currently migratory children often need an introduction into the system and a boost of confidence, while formerly migratory children tend to be better assimilated and ready to pursue specific and perhaps more ambitious academic goals. In this way, said one local coordinator, formerly migratory children are more like other disadvantaged students.

Support Service Needs

When discussing the support service needs of migrant children, state directors and local project coordinators tend to focus on two areas: health-related needs and advocacy or counseling needs. Almost without exception, coordinators said that the children in their summer projects often need extra medical attention, such as dental screenings, eye glasses, and physical examinations. Dental services were of particular concern, possibly, one local coordinator speculated, because home remedies do not exist in dentistry, as they do in other areas of health care. Staff members at one site reported that 85 percent of the children in their summer program lacked routine dental care. Migrant children also often lack adequate clothing, according to local coordinators, although this clearly is a more severe problem during the winter than in the summer months and in Northern states more so than in Southern states. Coordinators also cited needs for adequate nutrition and improvement in general hygiene.

In addition to their need for health-related services, migrant children and their families also routinely need the services of a counselor or advocate. For example, many mobile migrant families, particularly those from different cultural backgrounds, arrive in a community with no clear idea of how to access available services. A major challenge of coordinators at many summer projects is to help these families become more self-sufficient by teaching them what services are available in their community and how to obtain them. The need for this kind of advocacy can be a distinguishing feature between currently and formerly migratory families; having already had the opportunity to learn about available services in their community, formerly migratory children may be more "plugged into" a community than currently migratory children. However, other coordinators argued that currently and formerly migratory children are equally removed from their communities and need similar amounts of counseling and socialization assistance.

A number of coordinators also said that migrant students often need counseling to help mitigate low self-esteem and sociability problems. Even after learning how to access services in the community, migrant families rarely feel as if they "belong." This may be especially true of those who come from culturally and linguistically different backgrounds. To make matters worse, said one coordinator, some migrant children come from dysfunctional families and live under the primary care of older siblings, legal guardians, or a single parent. For these children, the need to feel part of a stable community is even greater.

Most state directors and local coordinators with whom we spoke said there is little, if any, difference between the support service needs of currently and formerly migratory children. Others disagreed. For example, a few coordinators said that formerly migratory children seem more

comfortable in their communities, while currently migratory children tend to need more personal attention and require more help accessing services. Other coordinators said that currently migratory children often have more urgent health needs than formerly migratory children.

Notably, coordinators at several sites mentioned differences between rural migrants and those living in urban or suburban regions, claiming that this geographical distinction is more meaningful than the currently/formerly distinction when assessing support service needs. Migrant children in urban and suburban areas may have greater need for counseling than rural migrants because of social pressures more often associated with city living, such as exposure to intimidating recruitment efforts by gang members. Coordinators also mentioned drug use and unstable family units as social problems more common among migrant children living in urban or suburban neighborhoods. On the other hand, rural migrants have less severe social pressures, but often have greater educational needs. Furthermore, migrant children living in remote areas are more difficult to serve because it is expensive to transport them to a school campus or to centers where health and other social services can be provided.

The Unmet Needs of Migrant Children

Very few coordinators at the sites we visited had conducted a formal assessment of the extent of unmet need among migrants in their area, but all spoke about two types of unmet needs: (1) eligible migrant children who for a variety of reasons receive no services during the summer and (2) inadequate services for summer school participants. Most coordinators estimated the proportion of eligible migrant children who receive program services during the summer and the figures ranged tremendously. At least one coordinator reported serving over 90 percent of the migrant children in the area; at a different site, a knowledgeable staff member stated that barely one-quarter are able to participate in the summer project. While one might expect that projects providing both campus-based and home-based services would be able to serve a larger percentage of migrant children, our limited sample of sites did not reveal any predictable relationships between the types of services provided (i.e., campus-based, home-based, or a combination) and the proportion of migrant children served.

Explanations of why so many migrant children go unserved vary from site to site. Some projects, for example, simply can not afford to serve all of the migrant children in the area. This may be especially true of sites without local district-funded summer school for migrant children; among the sites we visited, those with district-funded summer school available to migrant children tended to serve a greater percentage of eligible migrant children than those without it. Other projects have difficulty finding enough qualified staff to work during the summer. Some cannot provide

transportation to all of the area migrants, particularly those in more remote areas. Some migrant children, however, do not receive summer services because they and their families do not seek them. For example, many older migrant children choose to work instead of attend school. In addition, some migrant children stay home to care for younger siblings while their parents work, and thus cannot participate in campus-based summer activities.

For these and other reasons, substantial numbers of migrant children do not receive any services during the summer. However, some coordinators said the greater problem is providing adequate services to those who do participate in summer projects. More than one local coordinator admitted that, because funding formulas are based on the number of migrant children served, summer projects may limit the amount of service provided to any individual in order to serve the maximum possible number of children.

When asked what additional services were needed in their summer projects, local coordinators' responses generally fell into one of two categories: (1) services that would allow more migrant children to participate in the project and (2) services that would address unmet educational and support service needs of migrants. Many coordinators claimed they could serve more children by providing transportation for migrant families living in remote areas; limited funds, however, often preclude this service option. A few individuals also mentioned that offering daycare services for younger migrant children would allow more of their older siblings to attend summer projects. Daycare is also an expensive service, especially for projects that operate out of public school facilities, which generally need renovation to meet licensing code requirements.

Unmet Educational Needs

The greatest unmet educational need at the sites that we visited appears to be bilingual\ESL instructors to teach language minority students. Citing the large numbers of LEP children attending their projects and the shortage of qualified bilingual staff willing to work during the summer, many local coordinators said they needed more (or in some cases any) bilingual instructors. Notably, this need for additional bilingual staff was less common at the six California sites that we visited than at study sites in other states.

In addition to the many LEP students participating in summer projects, there are other specific groups of migrants whose educational needs are especially difficult to serve. For example, summer projects may be better equipped to meet the educational needs of children in grades K-12 than less-traditional groups of students, such as prekindergarteners and older dropouts. One migrant director

said that, instead of receiving developmentally appropriate prekindergarten instruction, three- and four-year-old migrants in the state are mixed with older children in classes as large as 35 students. Such arrangements, however inadequate, keep young children from sitting for hours in hot cars and trucks while their parents work; they are also the only service available at this time when almost no other preschool programs exist across the state.

Dropouts and older migrant youth present a different set of challenges for summer migrant education projects. Many work, look after younger siblings or their own children, and come from backgrounds that in various ways distance them from the curricula that schools offer. Inadequate housing in some areas also undermines stable relationships between schools and migrant youth, pushing long-term educational goals further out of reach. A few migrant educators also discussed the need for classes to help migrant parents learn basic academic and communication skills, achieve a General Education Development (GED) diploma, and learn about effective parenting.

Unmet Support Service Needs

While summer projects aim to address the support service needs of migrant children, most coordinators admitted that some of these needs also remain unmet. For example, many summer projects offer medical and dental screenings but are unable to arrange for the provision of more comprehensive health services. In other cases, because of limited funds, even the most basic medical services are not available. For example, one California site that we visited is located in a region that has recently experienced a significant reduction in funds relative to its skyrocketing student enrollment. As a result, the region's dental service allowance dropped from $8.77 to $3.71 per student in just two years, from 1987-88 to 1989-90. In 1987-88, the region distributed 6,000 toothbrushes and dental floss to almost as many migrant students; two years later, it purchased fewer dental supplies for a student population that had doubled.

A number of coordinators with whom we spoke lamented their inability to provide better counseling services to those migrant children and their families who face adjustment problems. Families new to a community need help learning about services, and many lack the cultural experience to know where to start. In addition, migrant children often face extreme social pressures and need counseling to address problems ranging from low self-esteem to gang recruitment.

III. SUMMER SCHOOL SERVICES PROVIDED TO MIGRANT CHILDREN

States commonly respond to the plethora of educational and support service needs of migrant children by providing, among other things, summer school services. In this way, states take advantage of the summer recess to help migrant children learn basic skills, make up missed schoolwork, accrue credits toward graduation, and set their sights on college and career goals. Federal regulations require the educators of migrant children to plan and implement program activities, including summer school services, in coordination with a host of other federally funded programs--Migrant Health, Head Start, and the Job Training Partnership Act, among others. Beyond this mandate, however, state and local agencies enjoy a great deal of latitude in shaping summer projects to best assist children of migratory workers.

The State's Role in Designing Local Summer Projects

As a state agency program, migrant education is molded to varying degrees in each state by the educational beliefs and leadership styles of the state officials who administer it. In addition to their role as enforcers of the statutory requirement to give currently migratory children top priority for program services, staff members from the state offices we visited described themselves as having the statewide perspective necessary to determine the overall design of the migrant program. While states tend to let local projects make instructional decisions (e.g., to teach reading through discrete skills or in a more integrated fashion), we found state offices to be involved in determining the organizational structure for providing services during the summer. A critical question for most states is whether to organize summer migrant programs around home-based or campus-based instruction.

The following examples describe how state offices help design local projects through statewide policies regarding campus-based and home-based instruction.

- *Increasing Learning Opportunities*. Officials at one state office argued strongly that the Migrant Education Program's best method of boosting the educational achievement of migratory children is by providing additional opportunities for academic instruction. This means more actual instructional time, not substitute instruction, as is common in pull-out models. During the school year this means extending the school day, whenever feasible. During the summer, it means minimizing the dormant time children spend apart from educational materials and experiences.

One way to do this is to maximize the time during which summer services are available to eligible children, or, in other words, to extend the traditional five-week school-based summer program to cover the entire summer break. According to one state official, such a proposition is untenable given current funding levels, so a more innovative approach is needed.

In this state, the search for such an innovation gave rise in 1986 to home-study programs. They are, according to one state official, a less expensive way to provide service to children both before and after the campus-based program and rest on the belief that, "five weeks of summer school and seven weeks of home-study are better than five weeks of summer school and seven weeks of nothing." Since 1986, the state office has actively promoted home-study (through verbal advocacy and an incentive in the state's formula for making subgrants) as a supplement to school-based summer programs.

- *Serving Hard-to-Reach Students*. Another state has established a priority for campus-based services for migrant children ages 5-21, but does not discourage home-based services for preschool-age children; state staff recognize the value of family participation and the nearly prohibitive costs of upgrading existing school facilities to meet preschool facility codes. This state also uses home study on a statewide basis to serve migrant children who live in isolated areas within the state and who would otherwise not participate in any organized educational activities during the summer.

  In 1990, the state's subgrant procedure allowed students served through home-based instruction to generate 10 percent of the funds generated by students attending campus-based projects. The state later decided that 10 percent was too low a compensation figure and was, according to the state director, adjusting the subgrant procedure to more accurately reflect actual differences in cost between the two service delivery models.

- *Basing Services on Migrant Status*. Officials in a third state office noted that both campus-based and home-based instruction can be used effectively to serve students depending on local circumstances. The state recommends campus-based programs in areas with high concentrations of currently migratory children. The home-based model was designed and is recommended to serve areas with larger numbers of formerly migratory children, who rank second in priority for services.

  The rationale is that project staff can best serve formerly migratory children by advocating for their participation in other available programs; still, local staff are concerned about those formerly migratory children who reside in areas where no other educational services are available over the summer. The state's subgrant formula weights currently migratory children more heavily than formerly migratory children in order to compel local projects to heed the service priority for currently migratory children. The practical result is that local projects receive more money for campus-based projects if they do, indeed, follow the state's recommendation to meet the needs of currently migratory children at a school site.

Common among most state staff with whom we spoke--during site visits and the study's preliminary networking phase--was the belief that home-study programs have emerged as a response to decreased federal funding (see Appendix C); states simply have to find innovative ways to serve the target population with limited resources. Some local educators, including the superintendent of one regional state office, who adamantly opposes home-based services on the grounds that they are inappropriate and of inferior quality, that, in fact, states have developed and implemented home-study programs as a revenue enhancer--a loophole, of sorts--because they allow migrant education programs to boost their FTE counts by serving more children at a reduced per-child cost for longer periods of time during the summer.

Characteristics of Local Summer Projects

A brief overview of the 16 study sites is presented in Table 7. These summer projects reflect significant commonalities as well as differences, and demonstrate the local diversity that characterizes the national Migrant Education Program.

Project Objectives: What to Teach and How

Two educational objectives were common across the local sites we visited: to improve the basic reading, writing, oral language, and mathematics skills of all participants; and to help secondary students accrue credits toward graduation. Improving communication skills in English (as a second language) was also reported frequently as an objective for currently migratory children.

Beyond these educational objectives, we observed great concern among migrant educators about the emotional dissonance migrant children feel in their daily lives. Schools often present education as the highly prized passport out of migrancy, at times overlooking the fact that such a journey may require migrant youths to reject the family and community life that define their sense of self. It was not surprising then that our questions also turned up an emphasis on improving students' self-esteem and sense of efficacy. In the words of one respondent, "Most of our [migrant] kids don't see themselves as being as successful as they really are . . . they don't value their own ideas"; this, most agreed, is a problem that can undermine the achievement of any capable child. To assist migrant youth with this dilemma, more than one educator spoke of helping currently migratory secondary school students recognize their talents, expand the set of options they seriously consider for future employment, and use education as a way to maximize and realize those options.

The educators we interviewed also spoke about the importance of migrant children maintaining modal grade placement for their age and achieving at the level of their peers. Respondents invariably characterized the summer months as a critical opportunity for migrant children to either catch up or hold steady with their non-migrant and more advantaged peers. We found widespread awareness of statistics showing that (1) migrant children are more likely to be below modal grade placement than their non-migrant peers, and (2) promotion/retention patterns in the early grades can affect children's decisions to drop out of high school. Indeed, the chances of completing high school drop to 50 percent with one retention in grade, and diminish further to 15 percent with two retentions (Johnson, Levy, Morales, Morse, & Prokop, 1986). One study site included a related objective in its program application: "to monitor and advocate for appropriate age/grade placement for migrant children five and six years of age."

Services and Delivery Systems

At the local level, the study sites delivered services to migrant children in a variety of settings during the summer. However, each site used one or a combination of three general models.

Campus-Based Model: Simulating the Regular-Term School. The campus-based model is a traditional approach to schooling that we found in most of the study sites, several of which provided exclusively campus-based services. Buses carried children from a specified attendance area to and from a local school or university campus each day. Once on campus, the children spent two to seven hours in class with others of their approximate age, studying a range of subjects and practicing basic language and math skills. Some sites also provided art or music instruction and physical education (including swimming), usually to elementary school children.

Table 7

Descriptions of 16 Summer School Sites

Site	Number of Participants	Grades Served	Participant Migrant Status	Average Number of Service Days	Average Number of Hours of Service Per Service Day	Instruction Provided	Support Services Provided	Other Services
A	463	preK-12	84% formerly 16% currently	20 campus-based (preK) 1/wk for 4 wks home-based (elementary) 1/wk for 6 wks home-based (secondary) 5-19 residential camp	3.5 campus-based (preK) 1 home-based 10 residential camp	content-area subjects, ESL/bilingual, language arts, math, reading	health, library, meals, transportation	local district summer school for all elementary and secondary migrant children, 3.5 hrs. per day for 20-30 days
B	643	preK-12, ungraded	68% formerly 32% currently	23 campus-based (preK-8) 30 campus-based (secondary) 1/wk for 8 wks home-based 5 residential camp	4 campus-based (preK-8) 2 campus-based (secondary) 1 home-based 10 residential camp	adult and career education, ESL/bilingual, health and safety, language arts, math, reading, science, social studies, work study	counseling, dental, health, meals, transportation	limited local district remedial education
C	53	preK-7	83% formerly 17% currently	19 campus-based 5 residential camp	4.5 campus-based 10 residential camp	ESL/bilingual, language arts, math, reading	health, meals, parent training, transportation	local district summer school
D	1,267	preK-6	75% formerly 25% currently	25 campus-based 5-28 residential camp	4 campus-based 10 residential camp	computer literacy, math, reading, writing	health, meals, transportation	local district special education
E	635	K-8	81% formerly 19% currently	29 campus-based 5/wk for 3 wks community-based 5 residential camp	3.5 campus-based 5 community-based 10 residential camp	ESL/bilingual, math, oral language, reading (including focus on literature)	health, meals, transportation	local district special education
F	1,772	preK-12	66% formerly 34% currently	28 campus-based 2/wk for 8 wks home-based 5 residential camp	5.25 campus-based 1 home-based 10 residential camp	art, ESL/bilingual, math, oral language, reading, spelling, writing	health, meals, parent intervention, transportation	county special education, local district summer school
G	324	3-year-olds, preK-9, ungraded	49% formerly 51% currently	24 campus-based 1/wk for 5 wks home-based	5.5 campus-based 1.5 home-based	art, career education, ESL/bilingual, math, music, physical education, reading, vocational education, writing	meals, services for the handicapped, transportation	none
H	1,435	3-year-olds, preK-9, ungraded	34% formerly 66% currently	28 campus-based 1/wk for 6 wks home-based 5 residential camp	6 campus-based 1.5 home-based 10 residential camp	art, career education, computer literacy, ESL/bilingual, language arts, math, nutrition, reading, science, social studies, vocational education	meals, services for the handicapped, transportation	Chapter 1 reading and math in one district of regional program

Table 7

Descriptions of 16 Summer School Sites (continued)

Site	Number of Participants	Grades Served	Participant Migrant Status	Average Number of Service Days	Average Number of Hours of Service Per Service Day	Instruction Provided	Support Services Provided	Other Services
I	367	preK-12	7% formerly 93% currently	44 campus-based (day) 65 campus-based (evening) 1/wk for 3 wks home-based	7.25 campus-based (day) 3.75 campus-based (evening) 1 home-based	art, computer literacy, ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, PASS, physical education, reading, science, social studies	dental, clothing, medical, meals, parenting transportation	none
J	435	preK-12	16% formerly 84% currently	34 campus-based 1/wk for 3 wks home-based	7 campus-based (day) 4 campus-based (evening) 1 home-based	career education, cultural enhancement, ESL-/bilingual, math, music, oral language, reading, science, social studies, physical education	daycare, dental, clothing, medical, meals, transport- ation	none
K	180	preK-12	1% formerly 99% currently	29 campus-based (day) 23 campus-based (evening)	6 campus-based (day) 3 campus-based (evening)	ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, physical education, reading, science, social studies	health, meals, outreach, transportation	none
L	145	preK-8, ungraded	0% formerly 100% currently	29 campus-based	6 campus-based	ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, physical education, reading, science, social studies	health, meals, outreach, transportation	none
M	661	K-12	58% formerly 42% currently	29 campus-based 1/wk for 4 wks home-based 8 residential camp	6 campus-based (day) 2.5 campus-based (evening) 1 home-based 10 residential camp	career education, computer literacy, ESL/-bilingual, HEP, math, nutrition, reading, summer packet, swimming, theater	counseling, dental, health, meals, transportation	special education services provided by teachers in training
N	378	preK-12	71% formerly 29% currently	1/wk for 9 wks home-based (K-12) 1/wk for 18 wks home-based (entering K) 8 residential camp	1 home-based 10 residential camp	math, reading, writing, career education	advocacy, counseling, dental, dropout prevention, health, parent education, transportation, work experience	none accessible
P	123	preK-12	63% formerly 37% currently	39 campus-based (day) 8 campus-based (evening)	7 campus-based (day) 3 campus-based (evening)	art, ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, reading, science, social studies, spelling, writing	dental, health, meals, transportation	elementary: enrichment program for a fee
Q	277	K-10	68% formerly 32% currently	39 campus-based	5.75 campus-based	art, ESL/bilingual, language arts, oral language, math, music, reading, science, social studies	dental, guidance and counseling, health, meals, social work, transportation	secondary: make-up courses for a fee, community arts and crafts program for a fee

NOTES: The "average number of service days refers to the number of days of service provided to each child. For example, at Site A, each secondary school child received home-based instruction an average of 6 days. July 4th was not counted as a day of service.

SOURCES: All information except "number of participants" and "participant migrant status" was gathered during our onsite interviews. At all but one site, the numbers reported to us and recorded on MSRTS were comparable; we have recorded the MSRTS numbers. At Site E, the number of participants reported to us differed substantially from that recorded on MSRTS. We have recorded the MSRTS number here, however, per pupil cost information in this report is based on the sample described to us during our onsite interview.

Several of the study sites that served secondary school students offered classes in the evening to accommodate the older students' work schedules. One site scheduled "evening classes" from 2:45 until 9:00 pm to extend services to the maximum number of older working students. The students either found their own transportation to school, or buses were scheduled to make a second run to transport secondary school students after elementary school children had been taken home for the day. Secondary school students generally selected from a cluster of course offerings, usually including ESL, vocational education (e.g., driver's education, home economics), basic English and math, as well as independent-study courses available through the Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) program.[11]

Funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) paid for one to three meals each day, usually prepared and served in a cafeteria on campus. USDA funds generally bought a snack for students attending evening classes. (Several local project coordinators argued that the older students need a complete meal in the evening, even though they may not spend the minimum amount of time at school necessary under USDA guidelines to qualify for one.)

The typical campus-based classroom was staffed with a certified teacher and an instructional aide, though primary grade classrooms sometimes had two full-time aides assisting the teacher. Migrant youth, hired with JTPA funds at many sites and Mini-Corps[12] monies at the California sites, joined the summer project staff, most often serving as instructional aides in the classroom. Staff to student ratios ranged from 1:19 to 1:42 for teachers and from 1:20 to 1:48 for instructional aides. These numbers are somewhat deceptive, however, particularly for projects with high proportions of currently migratory children in them. As children came and went throughout the summer term, class size on any given day was rarely, if ever, at the higher levels.

---

[11] PASS is an independent study program that provides self-directed learning packages to migrant youth who wish to accrue credits for graduation from high school.

[12] Mini-Corps is a type of work-study program funded by the California Migrant Education Program. Mini-Corps participants are college students, mostly from migrant backgrounds, who are considering a career in education. Most work in the summer projects as instructional aides (some work as office assistants) to assist teachers, serve as role models for younger children, and gain teaching experience. Mini-Corps is funded out of Sec. 1201 funds, taken off the top of the state allocation before subgrants are made. The state allocates Mini-Corps "participant slots" to regional projects according to student FTE counts, with the understanding that Mini-Corps will pay the participants' summer salaries. Regional offices then sub-allocate the "slots" to project sites. The sites place Mini-Corps participants in roles that will benefit both the college students and the summer education projects.

According to migrant education program staff, the benefits of campus-based instruction include the following:

- Contact with caring adults--teachers and instructional aides--is as important a part of the educational process as time spent on academic pursuits. Campus-based instruction maximizes that contact.
- On campus, the migrant project can provide USDA-funded meals.
- On campus, staff have access to other instructional resources, such as school libraries and audio-visual materials.
- Adherence to the school routine is a critical part of children's preparation for the real world, including the world of work.
- Campus-based programs provide children the opportunity to socialize with their peers in a supervised setting.
- Classes on campus create the possibility for cooperative learning and other ad hoc student grouping arrangements.
- A central location and access to buses facilitates field trips, which are especially important for helping disadvantaged or culturally and linguistically different children broaden their experiential backgrounds.

Home-based model: Taking instruction to the family. Home-based instruction was under way at study sites in most of the states we visited; however, only one provided exclusively home-based instruction. Home-based instruction generally focused on one or two subject areas and was delivered to children individually or in small groups at their homes or a migrant camp. On average, children participating in home-based services received one to two hours of instruction each week during one or two visits from migrant project staff. The children were then expected to spend a certain number of hours each week studying independently. Some projects required children and, in some cases their parents, to sign a contract agreeing to work independently as part of the instructional arrangement.

Instructional aides were by and large the "teachers" at sites that provided home-based instruction, with three notable exceptions. One site used both certified teachers and aides interchangeably. At another site, roughly half of the home-study aides had teacher certification, but they were hired as aides and compensated accordingly. The one site that provided home-based instruction exclusively hired teams--a certified teacher and an instructional aide--to visit the children's

homes. Generally, when aides provided the home-based instruction, the aide met each week with a supervising teacher to discuss students' progress and plan subsequent sessions.

While this study did not set out to assess the quality of instruction provided during the summer and did not observe instructional sessions, differences among home-based programs described to us were striking, particularly between those local projects that had very recently begun home-study and those with years of experience.

One state began providing home-based instruction in 1989 and implemented two different versions of it in the summer of 1990:

- *Migrant children achieving at or near grade level and/or who attended a campus-based project* were believed to need some organized program to keep them in touch with schoolwork during the weeks when they were not attending the campus-based classes. They received minimal assistance from this home-based program: a packet of independent study materials and three one-hour visits, over a six-week period, from either a certified teacher or an instructional aide. During the first visit, the instructor administered a placement test to determine grade level proficiency and assign a packet of independent study materials. The second visit, three weeks later, was devoted to checking on the student's progress in working through the packet and providing any needed assistance. Three weeks later, the instructor visited a third and final time to administer a posttest.

- *Migrant children who were achieving below grade level, in danger of failing a grade or course, and who received no other summer services* because they worked, cared for other children, or lived in a remote area received more intensive instruction. A certified teacher--using the same assessment tools and the independent study packets, including PASS units for students who needed particular course credits--spent four hours each week at the student's home teaching academic content.

In contrast is a state that has been refining home-based instruction and materials development (home-study learning packets) over a period of five years. One site in the state has worked through a regional curriculum committee to select appropriate materials for each grade level in reading, math, health, and language development, and to coordinate the content of the home-study packets with the curricula of the region's five counties. This type of coordination makes sense because roughly two-thirds of the site's summer migrant children are formerly migratory. Home-study tutors visit the children's homes twice a week for approximately 30 minutes a visit per child; a family with four children accumulates about two hours of instructional time for each semi-weekly session. Some of

the tutors set up pen pal networks among their home-study students. The staff have also developed an activity guide to promote literature appreciation by helping students read, understand, and enjoy the books they receive through the Reading Is Fundamental program (Figure 2).

Figure 2

Activities Guide for Promoting Literature Study

READING IS FUN: Activities Guide for Grades 4 - 8
(selected portions only)

Reading

- Read aloud to your tutor.
- Let your tutor read to you.
- Read your favorite passage to your tutor.

Speaking

- Summarize the story.
- Tell someone about your favorite character.
- Pretend you are doing a commercial to sell the book.

Spelling

- Choose spelling words.
- Make a crossword-spelling puzzle.

Writing

- Write a summary of the story.
- Write a letter to the author.
- * Use *Book Reporter* to make a news advertisement.

Geography

- Use the map to locate the continent where you believe the story took place.
- Locate the country where the book was published.

...And More

- * Do a *Picture Post Card.*
- * Make a *Peephole Box Diorama.*

* Form available for the activity

Proponents of home-based instruction described the following benefits of this service delivery model:

- Migrant projects can work with a larger proportion of the eligible population through home-study because staff can take instruction to the most hard-to-reach students--those who, for a variety of reasons, will not or cannot attend a campus-based program.
- Independent study nurtures students' sense of responsibility and extends the amount of time when they are in touch with academic material during the summer recess.
- Home-based instruction appears to be a viable strategy for delivering services to young children, particularly in areas where licensed facilities are scarce or nonexistent.
- Home-based instruction is an ideal arrangement for involving parents in family literacy programs or teaching parenting skills, provided that scheduling ensures one or both parents are present during the home visits.
- Older migrant children who can't attend a campus-based program because they work or care for younger children can participate in home-study programs that allow them to arrange study time around their work and/or childcare schedules.

Residential camp-based model: Expanding children's conception of learning. Various sites also offered selected students the opportunity to attend some type of residential camp for one to four weeks. In many cases, the camp experience supplemented other services provided by local migrant education projects during the summer. The curricular focus and the number of participants varied across sites. Following are some examples of this type of instructional model:

- *The Summer Leadership Conference* was available to ten adolescents from each summer project in one of the states we visited. All expenses were paid at the state level with Sec. 1201 funds. Students lived on a college campus for 8 to 10 days and received intensive instruction and individualized tutoring to help them prepare for the state's high school equivalency examination. Students also attended various cultural and recreational events while on campus.
- *The Outdoor Education Camp* was funded with Sec. 1201 funds from the state level in one of the states visited in this study. Local projects were given a number of participant slots based on their total enrollment; local staff selected students who would most likely benefit from the experience. Participants spent five days and nights at a camp where they studied flora and fauna of the sea, survival skills, and nature appreciation.
- *Yo Puedo* (translation: I am able) was a residential academic experience for migrant children in grades 5 and 6 from one state in this study. The students boarded and

studied at a community college for four weeks during the summer. The migrant project paid a $200 participant fee for each child; the community college furnished the living accommodations, teaching staff, and all instructional materials.

- *The Space Camp and Academy,* sponsored by NASA, is available to students across the country. Local educational programs and school districts pay tuition for selected children to spend a week in Alabama learning about space exploration and undergoing simulated training for astronauts. Students participating in the summer migrant education project in one of our study states attended the camp in 1990.

According to state and local educators, the principal purpose of operating these residential camps is to expose migrant children to enriching life experiences that can help broaden their sense of the world in which they live and mold their expectations for the future--experiences that tend to be a natural part of the lives of their more advantaged peers. Referring to the positive effects of the community college camp, one regional project director claimed, "Before *Yo Puedo*, [our migrant] students didn't go to college. Now, after eight years, some have gone to Stanford and Cal Tech. [Camp] is very powerful and very easy . . ."

Combination programs: Diverse services for a diverse population. More common than any of the three models in isolation was some combination of the three. Many sites offered all three. Of the sites that provided both home- and campus-based instruction, most reported that 50 to 100 percent of the participants received multiple services. Most of the children who were selected to attend a residential camp, at the sites offering such an opportunity, also benefitted from home- and/or campus-based assistance.

Local projects in one state used home-based instruction to fill the gaps during the summer recess both before and after the traditional campus-based summer school. In this way, staff argued, migrant children stay in touch with academic pursuits during the entire summer recess. In another state, one site had considered the before- and after- arrangement, but found it untenable, primarily because the state-required paperwork was prohibitive. Because the state has opted to fund campus-based and home-based instruction at different levels, local projects must document the type and duration of service delivery each student receives; the documentation process itself is said to divert an inordinate amount of staff time away from providing direct services to children. Instead, project staff used home study to serve migrant children who would otherwise receive no services because they cannot or will not go to a campus for instruction. Most sites also arranged for migrant children to participate in other special activities, such as day camp sponsored by the Girl Scouts of America or the YMCA, mini-sessions about proper nutrition presented by a local 4-H Club, or open-house at the public library. The most elaborate summer project schedule we found (Figure 3) included a campus-

based program for 70 percent of the children and a host of residential camp and other special activities to enrich the summer experience and reach the remaining 30 percent.

Figure 3

Summer Schedule of One Particularly Extensive Summer Project

Program	Number of Participants	Week 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Campus-Based School preK-grade 6	876			XXXXXXXXX							
Gifted Program grades 2-6	25			XXXXXXX							
Healthy Kids Club grades 2-5	75	XXXX									
Residential Camp (at a university) grade 6	22			XXXXXX							
Residential Camp (at a comm. college) grades 5-6	33			XXXXXXXXX							
YMCA Day Camp grades 2-6	100	XX									
Day Camp grades 4-6	117							XXXXXXXXX			
Residential Camp (Mini-Corps) grades 4-6	40						XXX				
Parent Preschool ages 3-4, parents	26			XXXXXXXXXXX							

Coordinating Summer Services with Other Programs

Federal law emphasizes the need to coordinate services provided through the migrant education program with (1) regular-term instructional programs, (2) local schools and districts including district-sponsored summer school and year-round schools, and (3) other funding streams and available services (e.g., JTPA Migrant Health). At the local level and during the summer, each project's mix of coordination activities reflects characteristics of its student population and the programs and services available in its state and local region.

Coordination with Regular-Term Instructional Programs

Coordination between the summer migrant education project and the regular-term instructional program differed in the study sample by the predominant migratory status of the students and the number of school attendance areas covered by the summer project. In places where most of the summer participants were formerly migratory children who attended the district school during the regular term, coordination was a relatively straightforward task. Migrant staff and district staff met to discuss their respective programs and the students they had in common. However, the greater the number of school districts with which the summer project coordinated, the more complex and indirect the coordination activities became.

Local sites in the states we visited described various means of coordinating instruction for formerly migratory children:

- *Spring Planning and Fall Follow-Up.* In a summer site where the children served were from one school attendance area and were 85 percent formerly migratory, migrant education and district teachers coordinated instruction with relative ease. In the spring, resource teachers working in the summer migrant education project consulted with classroom teachers to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of individual migrant children. The resource teachers used this information to help build an instructional program for the summer term. At the end of the summer, the migrant project staff prepared a brief report of each migrant child's progress to help inform the child's teacher for the upcoming year.

- *Shared Staff.* At a summer site where two-thirds of the summer participants were formerly migratory children who resided in one school attendance area, staff--including administrators, teachers, and support personnel--who worked for the migrant project during the summer term also worked in the district during the regular term. They knew the district's curriculum and many of the children. This staffing arrangement promoted continuity of instruction because, as district staff, the migrant

education project teachers had attended district-sponsored workshops to learn about "whole language" strategies in language arts instruction and how to integrate instruction across subject areas using thematic units.

- *School Records, Counselors, and Other Resource Teachers*. A regional summer project provided direct service to children, most of whom were formerly migrant, from 54 school attendance areas at 14 schools. The regional migrant project staff consulted MSRTS records, test scores, and the curriculum directors, counselors, and resource teachers in the various districts to help inform their decisions about what and how to teach the children who attended during the summer. Secondary school counselors, for example, often knew which students needed to complete specific courses in order to graduate. Migrant education project staff then enrolled those students in PASS to complete the course requirement. Another key source of information about individual students who attended this project were parents; project staff often found that parents could help link summer and regular-term instruction.

Alternatively, at sites serving high proportions of currently migratory children, coordination tended to involve multiple indirect channels and a more complicated process. Because students came from a variety of schools in different districts and states, summer project staff members sought ways to obtain accurate information quickly.

- *MSRTS Records, Telephone Calls, and Interstate Visits*. T[illegible]he study sites--in a state that serves almost exclusively currently migratory children during the summer--used a three-pronged approach to instructional coordination. In addition to reviewing MSRTS records, summer school teachers and other project staff members routinely called the migrant children's home-base schools to find out the skills and concepts that should be introduced and reviewed during the summer. In addition, state officials had a reciprocal arrangement with the one state that is home base for most summer participants. Staff from both state offices visited each other during the year to participate in statewide training sessions and to discuss curriculum issues, credit accrual for secondary school students, and better ways to ease transitions for students who move between the two states.

- *Student Surveys, Telephone Calls, and Interstate Visits*. A site serving predominantly currently migratory children from one home-base state had found that individual MSRTS records weren't updated in the home-base state quickly enough to accommodate the massive spring migration north. So, site staff resorted to surveying secondary school migrant children when they arrived in the spring to find out the courses they needed in order to keep pace with their peers. Project staff then called the home-base schools to confirm individual students' needs, particularly when they involved accruing credit for graduation. In addition, the project coordinator visited the home-base state annually to speak with teachers at schools attended by most of the migrant children. The annual visit, according to the project coordinator, has helped keep communication lines open.

Relationship to District-Sponsored Summer Schools

District-sponsored summer school is only minimally accessible to migrant students for a number of reasons. First, it does not always exist. Many of the sites we visited had no local district-sponsored summer school services. Aside from this obvious problem, the following were cited by state and local educators as the most common barriers to migrant children's participation in district-funded summer school:

- Limited spaces may be filled before many currently migratory children arrive in the area.
- Transportation is not provided. A typical policy of local administrators, according to project staff, is to provide extra service for students who need it but to defer the responsibility for getting to the school to students and their families.
- The courses offered are not always appropriate. At the secondary level, districts usually offer core courses from their local curriculum during the summer. These courses are not necessarily those needed by currently migratory children for graduation in their home-base states. In addition, English as a Second Language or bilingual instruction is not always provided by the district-sponsored summer school.

Despite these barriers, project staff at the study sites where district-sponsored summer school did exist had found various ways to coordinate the two programs. Below are some examples:

- *Waiving Participation Fees*. A student at one of the study sites needed to retake a course he had failed but needed for graduation. The district offered the course over the summer, and migrant project staff arranged to enroll the student free of charge.
- *Providing Transportation*. Migrant students at one study site attended the district-sponsored summer school for 20-30 days and received home instruction from migrant education staff both before and after the school-based program. Sec. 1201 funds also paid for bus service to transport the migrant children to and from the school because the district did not provide transportation.
- *Advocating Appropriate Placement*. In the state where district-sponsored summer school was most prevalent, though by no means widespread, local project staff reported that they did their best to arrange for those migrant children to attend who could benefit from the program offered and could get to the school.
- *Co-funding Staff*. One district offered three 15-day sessions of summer school. The first session--including four hours per day of instruction, lunch, and transportation--was entirely funded by the district, except for five teachers who were paid with Sec. 1201 monies. All eligible migrant children attended. The second session included the same services but for migrant children only. The third and final session was also for

migrant children only, but transportation was not provided; thus, project teachers taught whomever came to school in the morning, and visited homes during the afternoon to teach those who could not get to school on their own.

Issues Related to Year-Round School

Roughly half of the local school districts in one state in our sample implement year-round schooling. Many of the year-round schools operate under a "multi-track" schedule, in which each student is assigned to one of three or four schedules. Each track includes the traditional nine months of school and three months of vacation, but on a revised schedule: three months of school is followed by a one-month vacation, or intersession, and the cycle is repeated three times during the calendar year. The tracks are coordinated so that during any given month, only two-thirds to three-quarters of the district's students are in school.

We learned of no migrant project site that had found a way to maximize service and minimize cost by coordinating with year-round schools. The problem is rooted in one of the original purposes for adopting year-round schooling: construction of school buildings has not kept pace with the state's growing school-age population. Space is limited, thus forcing schools to keep their doors open 12 months a year. According to state officials, because space is the limited commodity, the migrant program has been unable to "piggy-back" onto these year-round programs for summer school. During summer months, year-round schools are full to capacity with students on one or more tracks in the year-round schedule. Thus, migrant projects are obliged to find schools that have not yet adopted the year-round schedule in which to operate their campus-based summer services. Migrant education program staff raised concerns about the long-term prognosis for campus-based programming, given the recent ground swell of year-round scheduling and financial woes across the state.

The findings of other researchers suggest that integrating special classes for migrant children into a year-round school schedule, while possible, may be very difficult to arrange on a large scale. Panton and Rosenthal (1991) report anecdotal evidence that schools using year-round calendars tend to offer remedial and/or enrichment programs during intersessions for the most needy students. However, the programs are incompatible with the comprehensive nature of summer migrant education services. The intersession programs are usually only two or three weeks long, accommodate limited numbers of students, and may operate in the school cafeteria or some other substandard learning environment. Furthermore, while such programs may be accessible to formerly migrant children, it is easy to imagine many barriers to participation for currently migratory children (e.g., discrimination

against non-resident children for limited numbers of slots; selection of participants before migrant children arrive into the area).

At first blush, single-track schools using a year-round calendar appear to be more promising for coordination with summer migrant education programs than multi-track schools, but upon closer examination, they too present serious drawbacks. Although a migrant education program could have full use of the school facilities during the intersessions of a single-track school, it would not benefit from school-funded services such as bus transportation, food service, site administration and clerical services, daily maintenance and custodial services, and the like. The three- or four-week intersessions throughout the year could be used to supplement the regular-term educational services for formerly migrant children, but would be more problematic for the large numbers of currently migrant children who move into a school attendance area during the summer. Migrant education programs in "receiving" states or regions would have even less time than is available during the traditional summer recess to enroll, assess, and teach students, and complete the paperwork required both before and after the provision of services.

Coordination with Other Funding Streams and Service Providers

Coordination with other funding streams and service providers has long been a requirement of migrant education and is widely considered to be a strength of the program. Indeed, coordination is gaining acclaim in the research literature on services integration as an effective way to improve the lives of disadvantaged children and their families (Reisner, Morrill, Chimerine, & Marks, 1991). Project staff at our study sites talked of their advocacy work to ensure that migrant children receive appropriate educational services (e.g., Chapter 1, special education, gifted and talented) and gain access to extracurricular activities, counseling, health, and other social services. However, they also reported that funding shortages have curtailed the migrant education program's sponsorship of these integration efforts and its ability to initiate and nurture long-term alteration in the way local and state educational systems serve migrant children.

We discovered that sites with year-round staff tended to have more stable relationships with other educational programs and service providers than did summer-only programs. For example, full-time project resource teachers spent the entire calendar year establishing relationships with staff in the districts served by a regional migrant education project. At summer school sites where staff were busy with other, non-migrant related responsibilities during the school year, there was less continuity in these cooperative arrangements. In some cases, summer project staff worked in different districts

during the summer and regular terms, which, they reported, hindered their abilities to forge strong partnerships with other programs and service providers.

Nonetheless, migrant education staff at many sites described the ways they sought to coordinate project services with others. Such coordination appears to depend greatly on the energy and persistence of project staff members. For example, we found migrant educators at one site cajoling the local adult education staff into providing GED classes for migrant students by suggesting that the two programs co-fund the teacher. Somewhat surprising to us was the absence of cooperative arrangements with the Title VII bilingual education program and special education, especially given the high proportions of LEP students and the reported problems in special education access experienced by migrant children.

Most of the coordination arrangements we learned about related to support services. Among them were arrangements with the following:

- *U. S. Department of Agriculture*. All but one study site (the one providing exclusively home-based tutorial instruction) relied on the USDA for funds to buy foodstuffs and hire personnel to prepare and serve meals to students on a daily basis, in most cases including breakfast, lunch, and a late-afternoon snack.

- *State Health Care Systems and Local Providers*. Staff members at most of the sites described efforts, usually in the form of personal appeals, to persuade local health care providers to attend to migrant children's medical and dental needs for free or reduced fees. However, migrant education projects in one state benefitted from coordination with the state's Child Health and Disability Prevention Program (CHDPP). The CHDPP pays for physical examinations and follow-up care for any child, from birth to 18 years of age, living at 200 percent of the federal poverty level or lower. Migrant educators in this state take on the role of advocate to see that migrant children gain access to these free services.

- *Job Training Partnership Act*. Several of the study sites hired migrant and other youths to work in the summer migrant education project using funds provided under the JTPA.

- *Migrant Head Start*. One site had cooperative arrangements with Migrant Head Start. The two programs occupied the same facility and shared resources: Migrant Head Start provided instruction for preschoolers and the migrant education project paid for the children's transportation.

- *Title XX Infant Daycare*. One site provided infant daycare and preschool services using a combination of federal Title XX and state preschool monies.

In-Kind Contributions

In-kind contributions were a significant part of program services at every study site. The summer project grants leveraged a wide range of additional resources, from clothing donated by local churches to swimming lessons taught through the YMCA. If we count the use of school district or college facilities, equipment, and instructional materials, it seems clear that without in-kind contributions, many summer projects would not operate at all.

Differences in Services for Currently and Formerly Migrant Children

Despite collection of detailed information about the classroom configurations of campus-based services and the caseloads of home-based instructors, we found no overall pattern of difference between the services provided to currently and formerly migratory children. Projects tended to group children for campus-based services based on their age/grade level. In many cases, project staff did not know the proportion of currently versus formerly migrant children in each class; migrant status was simply not considered to be a salient variable for grouping. Home-based instruction tended to be targeted on either all children in a project area or those who could not or would not attend a campus-based program.

Only one state in our study sample made a distinction between currently and formerly migrant children in decisions related to the delivery of instruction. This state promoted campus-based instruction for currently migrants and home-study for formerly migrants. Because currently migrant children are the first service priority under the law and are more likely to be limited English proficient and thus need intensive oral ESL instruction, the state has said they should have access to campus-based instruction which provides more time with a teacher and relies less on independent study.

Participation data tell a slightly different story about the variation in amount of service received by currently and formerly migrant children. Table 8 shows that, on average, formerly migrant children in the states in our sample were enrolled in a summer project for more days than currently migrant children.

Table 8

Student Enrollment in Summer Projects for 1989 by State and Migrant Status

State	Average Number of Days Enrolled	
	Per Currently Migrant Child	Per Formerly Migrant Child
California	44	51
Georgia	48	71
Michigan	40	48
Minnesota	37	41
New York	54	64
Utah	58	64

SOURCE: Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

IV. THE COSTS OF SERVING MIGRANT CHILDREN DURING THE SUMMER

Unlike the Chapter 1 basic grant program and regular-term migrant education services, the summer-term migrant education projects generate funds in direct proportion to the number of children served. This arrangement presents an obvious and difficult trade-off for administrators seeking both to deliver high quality services to children and preserve their programs. They can try to serve large numbers of migrant children, however meagerly, in order to boost FTE counts and, hopefully, funding for the subsequent year. Or, they can concentrate more comprehensive services on fewer children, thus reducing FTE counts and, likely, the following year's funding. Staff members at the state offices and local sites we visited expressed concern about this dilemma, finding neither option desirable. To strike a middle ground, some sites have combined service delivery models (e.g., more intensive campus-based and less intensive home-based instruction) as described in Chapter III of this report. Some state officials disclosed another way to pay for provision of the more intensive, campus-based services during the summer--using funds generated during the regular school year to help pay for summer school services.

Summer-Term Costs as a Proportion of States' Annual Allocations

Some states allocate a higher percentage of grant funds to summer services than is actually generated during the summer months. ED allocates Sec. 1201 funds to states annually; each state receives a total dollar grant, which is not divided between regular and summer terms. State offices and operating agencies then decide how to apportion the money between the regular school year and summer term. Utah, for example, serves migrant children during the summer only. This arrangement is based on the belief that migrant education should provide truly supplemental services, not a replacement for services properly provided to all children. Thus, the state director chooses to serve migrant children in the summer when they are not receiving other academic and support services as a way to augment the educational services they receive during the regular school year from district schools.

Although the other five states in our study serve migrant children year round, it appears that in Michigan and Minnesota, at least, funds generated by the year-round residency FTEs help defray the costs of summer services. Table 9 shows that, while only 28 percent of Michigan's annual migrant education program allocation was generated during the summer period by summer school

participants, approximately 46 percent of the 1989 allocation was spent on summer-term services. Similarly, while 33 percent of Minnesota's revenue-producing FTEs came from the summer, roughly 66 percent of the state's annual allocation was spent on services for children during the summer of 1990.

In contrast, California, reported (based on budgeted cost figures rather than actual expenditures) a balance in the amount of funds generated and expended during the summer. One state official reported a one-to-one match between funds generated during the summer by summer school participants and the state's summer school budget for 1991. The SEA had budgeted roughly $21 million dollars for the 1991 summer school program: over $16 million was generated by summer FTEs and an additional estimated $5 million (5 percent) from residency FTEs--generated by summer school participants during the summer months--for a total equal to the budgeted amount. This situation in California is probably related to a number of factors, including the fact that, of the states in this study, California makes the most widespread use of combination programs to expand the amount of time students are served during the summer months, which has the effect of increasing the number of summer FTEs generated.

Table 9

Proportion of Annual Allocation Generated by and Expended on Summer Services by State

State	1990-91 State Allocation in Dollars	% of 1990-91 Allocation Generated by Summer FTEs	% of 1990 Allocation Generated During the Summer Service Period by Residency FTEs of Summer School Participants	% of 1990-91 Allocation Generated by Summer School Participants During the Summer Service Period	1990 Summer-Term Expenditures	
					$ Amount	% of Annual Allocation
CA	93,155,567	17%	5%	22%	a/	--
GA	2,435,322	25	8	33	a/	--
MI	10,499,948	22	6	28	$4,178,233	46%
MN	2,057,837	26	7	33	1,265,184	66
NY	6,349,210	25	8	33	a/	--
UT	849,971	36	11	47	789,632	120

a/ California, Georgia, and New York subgrant funds annually, but not separated by school term. Utah presumably used carryover funds to help pay for the 1990 summer-term program.

NOTE: The figures shown do not represent a direct comparison between funds generated and expended because the 1990-91 allocations paid for summer school services provided during the summer of 1991. However, the comparison shown assumes a relatively stable relationship from one year to the next between the funds generated and expended during the summer months and a state's total annual allocation.

SOURCES: FTE figures were supplied by MSRTS; state allocations were supplied by ED; summer-term expenditures were reported by the respective state directors of migrant education.

Summer-Term Expenditures at Local Sites

It is difficult to derive directly comparable expenditure figures across sites for a host of reasons, including inconsistencies in service delivery models and staffing arrangements and questions about which funding sources to include. We took various measures to mitigate these confounding factors. In particular, our design for data collection entailed coding of personnel and nonpersonnel costs by delivery mode, which permitted us to differentiate costs by model.

Inconsistent staffing arrangements required special attention during data collection. At some sites, some project staff members worked year-round on migrant education, spending a portion of the regular school year preparing for summer school. At other sites, all staff members other than the senior administrator and perhaps a secretary or bookkeeper worked for the summer-term migrant education project only during the summer school contract period. We worked with individual staff members during our on-site interviews to determine reasonably accurate estimates of the time that year-round personnel spent on summer-related activities. In the majority of cases, we added one month to the actual summer-term contract period as the estimate of time spent during the regular school year preparing for or following up on summer-term activities. In those cases where we collected data on a sample of children served by a regional project, we prorated the regional office's expenses (both personnel and nonpersonnel) according to the number of students in our sample, and added these regional costs to the site costs in order to estimate the total service costs. Finally, we assigned average wage and benefit rates by job category to personnel across sites. This allows us to examine different combinations of resources exclusive of differences in compensation rates across sites.

Because we wanted to determine the total cost of providing summer services to migrant children, not just the portion funded by Sec. 1201, we adopted an inclusive approach to documenting the resources provided by different funding sources. We recorded the funding source(s) of each staff member's salary, including proportions from different funding sources, where applicable. We also collected data on all nonpersonnel expenses and recorded the funding source(s).

The residential camp activities were the only instance where we could not track down all costs associated with student participation. The camps were subsidized by a variety of funding agencies (e.g., local community college, NASA) to which we did not have access. We were able to account for participation fees, but could not determine the full per-child cost of participation. Finally, we gathered information about the in-kind contributions to all 16 sites for which we could not determine a dollar value. These are listed in Appendices E and F.

Despite these efforts to collect all expenditure data in a comparable way across sites, some degree of error certainly persists. Consequently, the cost profiles presented in this chapter are impressionistic rather than precise characterizations of the local sites.

Major Costs Categories

Appendix E shows estimated migrant education program expenditures by cost area and study site. (Actual expenditures would differ somewhat for all sites if actual, rather than average compensation rates were used.) Together, instruction and administration accounted for from 48 to 88 percent of total expenditures, with most sites reporting costs between 60 and 75 percent.

Instruction. Together, direct instruction (i.e., compensation and benefits for teachers and aides, materials, and mileage for home-based instructors) and instructional support (i.e., compensation and benefits for resource personnel such as counselors, librarians, and curriculum coordinators; materials; staff training) constituted the largest cost area, ranging from approximately 30 to 67 percent of total summer expenditures. Most sites reported instructional costs in the range of 40 to 55 percent. Within this category, personnel costs accounted for approximately 90 percent of the expenditures across sites.

Administration. With the exception of Site K (which had unusually high transportation costs [see Appendix D]), administration--including MSRTS activities--was the second largest cost area, ranging from roughly 12 to almost 37 percent of total summer expenditures. Administrative costs for most sites fell between 20 and 30 percent.

Recruitment and outreach. Costs associated with recruitment and outreach ranged from approximately 2 to 17 percent, with most sites reporting costs in the range of 4 to 9 percent. Surprisingly, we found no relationship between predominant status of participants (currently or formerly migrant) and reported expenditures for recruitment and outreach.

Transportation. Transportation costs (i.e., bus transportation to and from campus, field trips, and residential camps) ranged from under 1 percent at Site N, which provided almost exclusively home-based instruction, to almost 27 percent at Site K, where Sec. 1201 funds paid to transport all participating children (including 100 preschoolers attending a Migrant Head Start program at the same site) to the campus-based school each day. Most sites reported bus transportation (for campus-based services) expenditures in the range of 4 to 14 percent.

Meals. Meal costs ranged from under 1 to over 15 percent of total project costs, with most sites reporting costs between 5 and 11 percent of total expenditures. The USDA reimbursed sites for close to 100 percent of the cost of purchasing, preparing, and serving meals to migrant children. A few sites reported that their actual costs were slightly less than USDA reimbursement rates, and a few sites reported actual costs that exceeded the national rates. Meals were provided to students only at school campuses, not as a part of home-based services.

Health services. The provision and cost of medical and dental services varied greatly across sites. Some sites offered general physical examinations (medical, dental or both) to all participants, while others provided treatment on an as-needed basis. In California, project personnel usually acted as health counselors, screening children's health records and advising families where and how to get free services under the state CHDPP. Costs tended to fluctuate with the type of service. For example, physical examinations in one state cost approximately $10 to $20 per child, while the average per student cost of dental services for 14 students at another site was $98. In California, screening MSRTS health records and helping families receive follow-up care generally cost under $5 per child. On average, health costs comprised 2 percent of the sites' total expenditures, ranging from no health-related costs (at two sites where the state health program pays for all services) to almost 6 percent at both sites in another state.

Residential- and day-camp activities. Funds spent to send migrant children to participate in residential- or day-camp activities ranged widely, from 0 to 15 percent of total expenditures. Most of the sites that offered camp activities reported costs in the range of 1 to 6 percent of total expenditures. Site D, with 15 percent of total expenditures going to camp activities, offered the greatest variety of summer services of all the study sites, including five camps (see figure 3). By and large, these costs represent only per-child participation fees, not the total service cost. Camp programs were usually subsidized by other agencies (e.g., local community agency, Girl Scouts, NASA) or additional Sec. 1201 funds taken off the top of the state allocation before subgrants were made, and we were unable to track down these break-outs.

Funding sources. As reported elsewhere (Cameron, 1981), we found that Sec. 1201 funds paid for the major share of the costs of providing summer services to migrant children. Appendix F lists the amounts and proportions of total expenditures by funding source and site. It shows a range from 67 to 99 percent of total summer expenditures paid for with Sec. 1201 funds; most sites reported that Sec. 1201 paid for 83 to 95 percent of summer expenditures. USDA is the next most important funding source for summer projects, with most other sources contributing sporadically to project resources, usually in the form of a portion of an administrator's or clerical staff member's salary. In addition, while it is impossible for us to estimate the dollar value of in-kind goods and

services donated to summer migrant education projects, there is no doubt that they substantially increase the migrant education program's service capacity.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. The USDA, through the Summer Feeding Program, augments Sec. 1201 funds substantially. Among the study sites in our sample, USDA reimbursements accounted for summer expenditures ranging from under 1 percent, for Site A that bought lunch for 20 preschoolers, to 16 percent, for Site Q that provided three meals (breakfast, lunch, and a snack) each day to all participating children. Most sites reported that USDA funds accounted for 5 to 13 percent of their total expenditures. These costs are associated with campus-based services only.

The job training partnership act. Funds available under JTPA paid the summer salaries for various youth-program workers, such as instructional and office aides, at several sites. JTPA contributions ranged from 0 to 8 percent of total summer expenditures at our sites.

Other funding sources. Other funding sources--including Basic Chapter 1, Chapter II, Title VII, general state and local budgets, and state categorical monies--paid a small proportion of the total summer expenditures at most study sites. The largest contribution was at Site E, where general state and local funds comprised 22 percent of the summer expenditures, paying part or all of the summer contract salaries for staff such as the accountant, senior administrator (assistant superintendent), summer school principal, and summer school secretary (the migrant education project shared the school building with the district-funded summer school).

In-kind resources. At all of the local sites, the migrant education projects used the facilities, equipment, and materials of the host school district or college/university. Projects rented district-owned school buses, in most cases paying only the drivers' salary and a per-mile fee that contributed to the actual fuel, maintenance, and depreciation costs. In addition, project personnel tapped their networks of charitable organizations, individuals, and health-care providers to meet the emergency food, clothing, transportation, and medical needs of migrant children and their families.

Variation in Cost by Service Delivery Model

Both the personnel and nonpersonnel costs of providing campus-based services are higher than those costs associated with home-based services. Personnel costs account for the greatest variation between home-based and campus-based services, which is not surprising since wages and benefits

accounted for approximately 90 percent of all instructional costs.[13] A certified teacher and an instructional aide staffed most of the campus-based classrooms at the study sites; a number of classrooms, particularly in California, had two aides, with one funded by Mini-Corps or JTPA. In contrast, home-based instruction was delivered in most cases by one instructional aide or in a few cases by one certified teacher; at only one site was home-based instruction delivered by a team of instructors.

Another trend that accounts for the lower costs of home-based instruction is that the caseloads of home-based instructors were larger than campus-based class sizes, and students taught at home received substantially fewer hours of contact with project instructors (even though the home-based student groups were much smaller, presumably permitting more individualized instruction). Teacher contact during campus-based instruction ranged from an estimated 3.5 to 7.25 hours each day, four or five days a week, for four to nine weeks. Contact with an instructor delivering home-based services ranged from approximately one to two hours a week, for three to nine weeks. In California, time for home-based instruction was generally determined by family size, counting roughly 30 minutes per child. For example, a family with three children would get approximately 1.5 hours of service each visit; the instructor could decide on site whether to work with the children individually or in a group.

The nonpersonnel costs of campus-based programs are also higher. Campus-based programs usually include bus transportation and meals, and in many cases also include custodial services, rent, and/or utilities.[14] Although home-based services incur the transportation costs of instructors driving to children's homes to deliver services, they appeared to be significantly less than the cost of bus transportation. For example, one site reported spending approximately $12,904 to transport an estimated 503 children to and from school for 28 days. At the same site, home-based instruction for just over 1,000 students during an eight-week period (each child was visited twice a week for eight weeks) cost approximately $3,560 in mileage reimbursement. Table 10 shows these per pupil cost patterns across sites and is useful as an index of maximum per pupil costs across service delivery models. Table 11 shows the same per pupil cost patterns across sites minus food service costs, which are covered almost completely in every site by USDA funds under the Summer Feeding Program.

---

[13] This also means that when migrant children attend district-sponsored summer school, fewer Sec. 1201 dollars are needed. At Site A, for example, over 440 migrant children attended the district-sponsored summer school, which covered all instructional costs. The migrant project paid for recruitment and outreach, bus transportation, and health services--approximately half the total per child program cost.

[14] The difference between delivery models in terms of actual cost to the Migrant Education Program decreases somewhat considering that almost all meal costs are paid by USDA.

This adjustment moderates the differences between the costs of delivering campus-based and home-based services and gives a closer estimate of the per pupil costs (given maximum service) that would be charged to the Migrant Education Program. (A detailed per-pupil cost profile for one site is presented in Appendix G.)

We were unable to distinguish between materials costs for home- and campus-based instruction. While we saw some fairly elaborate home-study packets, we have no reason to believe that children do not use and consume substantial materials on campus as well. PASS materials appeared to be a significant expense to some sites. For example, Site F reported spending over $7,000 for the PASS materials required for 82 students to complete almost 300 units of study during the summer. However, as with other materials, we found PASS materials used as part of both home- and campus-based instruction. So, we attributed an average per pupil cost of all instructional materials at each site to both the home- and campus-based delivery models.

Sites J and M show the highest per pupil costs across service delivery models. At Site J this appears to be the result of a relatively high number of hours of instruction (i.e.,136 to 238), comparatively low class size (i.e., 14 to 23), and intensive staffing (i.e., one to two instructional aides assisting a certificated teacher in every classroom). Also, Site J was the only site to pay rent for office space. At Site M factors contributing to higher per pupil costs include the lowest average class size (11 children) across sites and high per pupil health costs. In contrast is Site I, which had a comparatively low per pupil cost for campus-based services given its relatively high number of instructor contact hours. This appears to be, at least partially, the result of the highest campus-based class size (42 children) among the sites.

The highest home-based costs appear at Sites F, J, and M. Site F hired migrant youth as work-study students to help deliver summer school services while completing high school coursework; their wages doubled the home-based costs. Costs at Site J may be somewhat inflated. Site J has a separate contract with the state office to (1) develop home-study packets for the entire state and (2) provide more intensive home-based services to students across the state who do not attend a campus-based project. We worked with project personnel during our site visit to tease apart these services and costs, but there may be some residual overlap. At site M, the relatively high cost is the result of comparatively steep dental costs, almost $100 each for the roughly 15 children who received them. Conversely, the least expensive home-based instruction was delivered at Site I, which piloted home-based instruction during the summer of 1990 and, by its own admission, did not spend much energy or resources on it.

Table 10

Estimated Per Pupil Costs by Site and Service Delivery Model

Site	Per Pupil Cost in Dollars			Average Total Instructor Contact Hours		
	Campus-Based	Home-Based	Residential Camp	Campus-Based	Home-Based	Residential Camp
A	$243	$125	a/	70	4-6	50-190
B	364	197	174	60-92	8	50
C	258	--	181	86	--	50
D	302	--	402	100	--	50-280
E	436	271	308	102	15	50
F	361	420	177	147	16	50
G	370	185	--	132	8	--
H	576	293	a/	168	9	50
I	563	130	--	244-319	3	--
J	1,101	421	--	136-238	3	--
K	839	--	--	69-174	--	--
L	794	--	--	174	--	--
M	1,017	398	443	73-174	4	50
N	--	225	353	--	9	50
P	646	--	--	24-273	--	--
Q	490	--	--	225	--	--

a/ Data unavailable

NOTE: Estimated per pupil cost is the personnel and nonpersonnel expenditures of all services a student could possibly receive through each delivery model. Campus-based costs include recruitment and outreach, instruction, administration, transportation, health services, meals, and extracurricular activities. Home-based costs include recruitment and outreach, instruction (including staff travel), administration, and health services. Per pupil costs for the residential camp programs include participation fee plus the costs of administration, recruitment and outreach, and health services associated with each site; they do not include host-agency subsidies. Average personnel wages and benefits were assigned across all sites by job code in order to focus attention on the cost of different combinations of resources exclusive of differences in salary and benefit rates.

Table 11

Estimated Per Pupil Costs Less Food Service Costs by Site and Service Delivery Model

Site	Campus-Based	Home-Based	Residential Camp
A	$206	$125	a/
B	322	197	174
C	237	--	181
D	261	--	402
E	392	271	308
F	331	420	177
G	326	185	--
H	527	293	a/
I	503	130	--
J	990	421	--
K	741	--	--
L	650	--	--
M	976	398	443
N	--	225	353
P	587	--	--
Q	413	--	--

a/ Data unavailable

We observed a trend for both home- and campus-based instruction: at most sites offering both bilingual and nonbilingual instruction, the per pupil costs of bilingual instruction were somewhat lower. This appears to be due primarily to larger class sizes.

Another way to compare the service delivery models is on the basis of their dollar-generating abilities. Table 12 shows that, on average, home-based services have a greater dollar-generating capacity than either campus-based or residential camp services relative to the amount of time children spend with an instructor. For example, at Site A, 70 instructor contact hours on a school campus over a period of 20 days generated 26 summer FTE days per child, which in turn had a value of about $140. Four hours of home-based instruction (one hour a week, once a week, over a four-week period) generated the same number of summer FTE days per child and, consequently, had the same dollar value. In contrast, a residential camp experience at Site A that provided approximately 50 hours of contact time with an instructor or camp counselor over a five-day period accrued only five summer FTE days per child at a value of roughly $27. These comparisons suggest that funds for migrant education program services are not generated and expended on an equal dollar-for-dollar basis by service delivery model (just as they are not generated and expended on a dollar-for-dollar basis by school term). It appears that, in a sense, at those sites that offer multiple types of services, home-based instruction helps to subsidize campus-based instruction and residential camp experiences.

Comparison of Costs for Currently and Formerly Migratory Children

Because we found no distinguishing pattern of services to determine differences in the costs of serving currently and formerly migratory children, we were unable to make a comparison. At a number of sites, administrators did not know the proportions of currently and formerly migratory children in each classroom or teacher caseload, so finding a differential pattern of services by migrant status was impossible.

Table 12

Estimated Summer FTE Value Prorated to Number of Service Days by Site and Service Delivery Model

Site	Average Total Instructor Contact Hours			# Summer FTE Days Accrued			Prorated FTE Value		
	Campus-Based	Home-Based	Residential Camp	Campus-Based	Home-Based	Residential Camp	Campus-Based	Home-Based	Residential Camp
A	70	4-6	50-190	26	26-40	5-19	$140	$140-216	$27-102
B	60-92	8	50	31-40	54	5	167-216	291	27
C	86	--	50	25	--	5	135	--	27
D	100	--	50-280	33	--	5-28	178	--	27-151
E	102	15	50	39	21	5	210	113	27
F	147	16	50	38	54	5	205	291	27
G	132	8	--	32	33	--	179	185	--
H	168	9	50	38	40	5	213	224	28
I	244-319	3	--	60-89	19	--	368-546	116	--
J	136-238	3	--	46	19	--	282	116	--
K	69-174	--	--	31-39	--	--	191-240	--	--
L	174	--	--	39	--	--	240	--	--
M	73-174	4	50	39	26	8	271	181	56
N	--	9	50	--	61-124	8	--	863	56
P	24-273	--	--	12-53	--	--	47-209	--	--
Q	225	--	--	53	--	--	209	--	--

NOTE: Estimated FTE values were calculated using the 1989-90 allocation for each state divided by the number of FTEs accrued during the 1989 calendar year. While it is possible to calculate the average FTE value generated for an annual allocation, it is impossible to calculate a precise average expenditure value given that allocations are generated by FTEs accrued during a calendar year but spent during the subsequent school year. Consequently, both the number of FTE children and the purchasing power of the dollar due to inflation will have changed from the time the allocation is generated and spent. Thus, the FTE values shown can be compared to one another to examine the relationships among service delivery models, but should not be compared directly to per pupil costs (for maximum service) shown in Tables 10 and 11.

Comparison of Summer-Term Costs and Regular-Term Costs

We did not collect the detailed expenditure information for services provided during the regular school year that we gathered for summer-term activities, but some comparisons seem supportable. Table 9 shows that at least three states use funds generated during the regular school year to pay for summer school services, suggesting that summer school is significantly more costly to operate. In addition, during the regular school year, Sec. 1201 funds supplement a much more complete regular program. For example, Sec. 1201 funds rarely, if ever, pay the salaries of school principals, classroom instructional teams, or daily bus transportation during the regular school year.

Variation in Costs Across States

The highest teacher compensation rates (wages and benefits combined) were in California and Utah, even though both states have average PPEs below the national average. The lowest rates were in New York, Michigan, and Minnesota. All three states have average PPEs above the national average.

California was unique in a number of ways. Together, the six sites offered the greatest variety of services to migrant children, with many children receiving services under more than one type of delivery model. In California, campus-based services tended to be offered for a shorter period of time, thus reducing campus-based costs. The state is, however, able to extend services at a reduced cost by offering home-based instruction at many sites both before and after the campus-based program. During this time, migrant children accrue both the residency and summer FTE credits that are used in calculating the state allocation for the following year.

Migrant children residing in California also benefit from the CHDPP. As a proportion of total project expenditures, California sites tended to spend the least on health services, with Sec. 1201 funds used primarily for distributing dental supplies (e.g., toothbrushes), screening children's MSRTS health records, and helping families avail themselves of treatment provided free through the CHDPP.

V. IMPLICATIONS OF PROGRAM AND EXPENDITURE DATA FOR CHANGES IN THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

As currently configured, the federal formula for distributing Sec. 1201 funds influences states' decisions about serving migrant children. Indeed, this is its intent; the summer adjustment was developed to promote summer services and does so by partially compensating states for the additional costs of serving children when local district schools are not in session. Under the summer adjustment, one day of enrollment in a summer school program is roughly equivalent to the funding power of three days of residence in the state during the year, and summer FTEs are added to the residency FTE count, thus double-counting children served during the summer. Some states and operating agencies use funds generated by both residency and summer FTEs to pay for services offered during the summer months. Interestingly, an individual student's year-round residency FTE credit does not carry with it a requirement for service, as does the summer FTE credit. The practical result is that during the regular school term, migrant educators can target services to those children most in need without fear of negative effects on their allocation for the following year.

The funding formula may further influence states' decisions about how to serve migrant children during the summer. There is some evidence that the emergence of home-based instruction over the past five years is an artifact of the summer adjustment: states can deliver home-based instruction during the summer and accrue dollar-generating FTEs while spending less per child than they would on campus-based instruction. There is also evidence, though far from conclusive, that any "extra" funds (i.e., funds generated by summer FTEs that are not actually used for these home-based services) are used to diversify summer services for small groups of migrant children--to help pay, for example, for residential camp experiences or work-study opportunities. We must be careful, however, about characterizing any funds as "extra," given the comprehensive nature of the services the migrant education program is charged with either providing directly or orchestrating. Although a couple of the largest states are reported to have high carryover budgets, that was not the case for the states involved in this study.

The states in our sample that offered exclusively campus-based instruction (which were also the states with the smallest allocations of the six sample states) reported the greatest financial woes. One state agency reported no carryover funds and said it had dipped into the next year's allocation to pay for summer services in 1990. The other state agency reported summer school costs in excess of its annual allocation; it presumably used carryover funds to make up the difference. Those states implementing both campus-based and home-based models reported carryover amounts of 1 to 8 percent of their annual allocation.

These observations present two questions in connection with the federal funding formula:

- What types of programs should the funds distribution formula encourage?
- How much disparity is acceptable in the type and amount of services offered in different states?

Which Programs Should the Funding Formula Encourage?

Congress has long promoted summer school as a way to help migrant children improve their academic and personal development, but there has been little to guide educators attempting to build effective summer programs. Research on the relationship between summer learning and school achievement is useful in examining the purpose, role, and effects of summer school services for migrant children, but the findings are inconclusive. In a review of the literature on summer school services for migrant children, Bogart (1990) reports:

> Researchers (see Coleman, 1982; Ginsburg, Baker, Sweet, & Rosenthal, 1981; Heyns, 1978) report that children learn more while attending school than while school is out, particularly in mathematics. An area of dispute, however, is Heyns' finding that socioeconomic factors influence the level of student retention over the summer. Heyns reports that children from higher socioeconomic backgrounds learn more during the summer months than children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (see also Coleman, 1982). Furthermore, as the level of students' socioeconomic background decreases, so does the level of summer achievement and retention, according to Heyns.
>
> Prior research, based on analysis of test scores (see Hammond & Frechtling, 1979; Pelavin & David, 1977), yielded conflicting evidence on summer gains for students in need of compensatory education. After examining this evidence in light of data collected for the Sustaining Effects Study, Carter (1984) concluded the following (see also Klibanoff & Haggert, 1981):
>
> - Large reading gains, and both gains and losses in math, were evident through the summer for all elementary school students, whether participating in compensatory education or not.
> - A comparison of high and low gainers indicated that high gainers often decrease their achievement level over the summer, while low gainers rise.
> - Losses in math achievement were more likely to occur in higher grades than in lower grades.

- No differences were found in comparing the summer achievement gains of students who attended summer school with those who did not (p. 19).

Taken together, these findings on the effectiveness of summer school instruction do not provide clear guidance on the best academic services, either for disadvantaged children or others. Nor do they offer guidance on the effectiveness of services designed to meet personal, health, and cultural needs that migrant education programs also seek to address.

There is similarly scant evidence to hail any service delivery model as superior in terms of student achievement, but there is some indication that each (home-based, campus-based, and residential camp-based) has a role that may vary based on local context and the characteristics of the student population. Dated but nonetheless robust research findings on academic learning time support campus-based instruction for low achieving elementary and secondary school students. The Follow Through observation study (Stallings, 1975) and the investigation of The Teaching of Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools (Stallings, Needels, & Staybrook, 1979) showed interactive on-task instruction (e.g., discussion and review, supportive corrective feedback) to be related to above average gains in reading. Noninteractive on-task instruction (e.g., written assignments, silent reading) was associated with slight gain or loss. While campus-based services do not guarantee the use of interactive instruction nor high on-task behavior, they do provide the setting for both: 17.5 to 30 hours a week of instruction in a classroom with a certified teacher, one or two instructional aides, and other students. By contrast, home-based services offer approximately one to two hours of teacher-student interaction each week, with heavy reliance on independent study, which is most likely noninteractive. (One site in the study was trying to change this arrangement by encouraging children to read to and discuss literature with others at home. See Figure 1.) In addition, the preeminence of oral language development among the factors considered to be critical for the development of communicative competence and literacy skills (see Glazer, 1989; Morrow, 1989; Strickland, 1989) argues in favor of campus-based instruction for elementary-grade children, especially LEP and non-English speaking migrants. Independent study alone is less likely to provide the interactive and language-rich environment needed for effective oral language development that many migrant children need.

On the other hand, home-based services appear to be particularly appropriate for certain groups of students, especially those who are reluctant or unable to participate in campus-based programs. For example, some dropout prevention and second chance programs offer flexible part-time scheduling or evening and Saturday classes in combination with some type of mastery learning curriculum. These services characterized some study sites for migrant youth whose work or childcare schedules deter them from attending a traditional summer school. Administrators at these sites

reported that they are able to attract more participants with this design than with traditional summer school services.

Home-based instruction may also be especially suited to family or intergenerational literacy programs for young migrant children and their parents. A number of family literacy programs supplement their center-based activities (in a school, workplace, community center, library, or shelter) with home-based instruction, and some rely on them exclusively. Nickse (1990) reports that, "Some family literacy programs in rural areas find home-based services the only feasible form of outreach, due to geographic isolation, poor or nonexistent transportation, long travel distances, severe weather conditions, or a lack of an appropriate space in communities" (p. 38).

Residential camp experiences add yet another dimension to summer programs for migrant children. At the sites in this study, camp experiences usually supplemented other services, and their curricular focus and number of participants varied widely. But state and local educators argue that residential camp is an extremely powerful, if expensive, way to expose migrant children to enriching life experiences that can broaden their sense of the world and mold their expectations for the future--experiences that tend to be a natural part of the lives of their more advantaged peers.

Overall, our analyses suggest that when summer projects offer a rich array of services, they are better able to meet the diverse needs of the populations they serve. Projects that attempt to serve all children through the traditional school model with graded classes that meet during the day at a central location may be just as unrealistic and unresponsive to the profound and diverse needs of their target population as those projects that assume independent study is appropriate for all elementary school children. We found strong evidence that a combination of home- and campus-based services along with residential camp experiences has high potential for engaging the most students in meaningful and appropriate educational activities during the summer.

How Much Disparity is Acceptable?

Summer services across states and localities differ. Some areas offer a menu of diverse programs tailored to specific subgroups of migrant children (see Figure 2), while others implement a single program into which all children must fit or not be served. Although there is undoubtedly room for more creativity in the design of summer services at any specific locality, it appears that states with larger summer budgets, more full-time staff, and a preponderance of formerly migrant children have certain advantages:

- States with larger summer budgets can provide a wider variety of service to migrant children, including residential camp experiences and work-study opportunities.

- Full-time staff at the state and local levels can spend more time refining services, whatever they may be, than can staff who have other non-migrant responsibilities. They can coordinate project activities with other funding agencies and service providers throughout the year, thus forging relationships that promote continuity in service delivery during the summer months and year after year.

- Staff can plan effective programs for resident children more efficiently than for children who come from other states. For example, at many California sites, project staff coordinate instruction by walking down the hall or driving across town to talk directly to children's regular-term teachers. In Michigan, however, a portion of the summer term is used to assess students' needs and communicate with home-base schools in Texas. State and local staff expend funds on additional coordination activities such as annual trips to Texas to maintain communication with teachers, administrators, and even migrant children and their parents. These long-distance coordination and communication activities are unnecessary in sites serving only formerly migrant children.

- Currently migrant children who migrate to poor communities for a few weeks or months are less likely to receive adequate services than formerly migrant children whose needs parallel those of resident children. For example, finding qualified bilingual staff and teachers trained in ESL techniques in California is less problematic than on Virginia's eastern shore,[15] where many such staff are needed primarily during the growing and harvest seasons. Substantial money and effort would be needed to lure qualified staff to that region for a few months, and, if they came, housing would be a problem.

Some disparities of serious consequence, such as the last example above, are probably beyond resolution through modifications in the federal funding formula alone. However, others, such as the second example given above, may not be. For example, there may be a minimal level of funding that ensures continuity of program development and maintenance throughout the year. Thus, it is important to consider, in light of what is possible through formula modifications, which disparities are acceptable and which are not. Below are some examples of each.

[15] Virginia was not in the study sample.

Examples of Possibly Acceptable Disparities

- Migrant children participate in a two-way bilingual program in their home-base state. The receiving state, however, offers only ESL instruction because there are very few qualified bilingual staff in the entire state.

- One state, based on its annual needs assessment, decides to provide all children with a routine medical and dental examination; a portion of each operating agency's subgrant supports this service. Another state decides to provide follow-up care to migrant children on an as-needed basis and not to screen all children; Sec. 1201 funds for follow-up care are administered statewide through a single operating agency. (This type of disparity may actually be desirable for "sending" and "receiving" states that serve many of the same migrant children.)

An Example of Possibly Unacceptable Disparities

- One state has funds sufficient to operate summer projects for substantial numbers of gifted/talented migrant children, while another state cannot even afford to conduct baseline identification and recruitment activities in remote areas.

Options for Funding Summer Services

Presented below are options for modifying federal law and regulation in order to achieve a more equitable distribution of funds and services nationwide. The options assume no major changes in funding trends. MSRTS staff could help estimate the actual effects of each option on each state's allocation using the MSRTS data base.

Increase the funds to states serving high proportions of currently migratory children. The statutory service priority for currently migratory children suggests support for a funding adjustment that promotes the delivery of comprehensive and high quality services to currently migratory children during the summer. Additional support for this option comes from this study's findings regarding the level of effort required to (1) coordinate services for currently migratory children, (2) recruit and retain qualified staff to work with LEP and non-English-speaking migrant children during the summer in "receiving" states that do not serve large numbers of such students during the regular term, and (3) help mobile migrant children gain access to other available services such as special education, Chapter 1, bilingual/ESL, and those for gifted/talented students. The scarcity of resources needed to address this third set of advocacy activities is particularly acute in states with relatively small annual allocations and few full-time staff members.

The historical arguments against differential funding based on migratory status have all been based on an examination of children's educational and support service needs. These examinations have generally concluded that migrant children have educational and support service needs greater than those of nonmigrants, regardless of the fact that such needs decrease the longer they are settled out (see, for example, U.S. Department of Education, 1990a; NASDME, 1989; Cox et al., 1992). The rationale for the funding option described here, however, is based on the finding that the levels of resource and effort that are required to adequately serve currently migrant children are substantially greater compared with those required to serve their formerly migrant peers. As we discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 of this report, serving high proportions of currently migrant children during the summer requires state and local projects to:

- Teach migrant families during a compressed time period what services are available in their communities and how to access them.
- Find, recruit, and hire teachers trained in bilingual and/or ESL instructional techniques, even when such teachers are not routinely employed by the district.
- Adjust programs up and down quickly to accommodate large influxes of mobile migrants.
- Establish and use a complex system of multiple and indirect communication channels to coordinate summer services with those provided to migrant children in a variety of schools and districts in different home-base (or "sending") states.

There are two obvious ways to increase funds to states that serve high proportions of currently migratory children during the summer: (1) provide concentration grants to them, or (2) increase the FTE value of currently migrant children during the summer. In either case, the benefit would be to provide the targeted states with more resources to better prepare themselves to serve mobile migrants when they arrive, provide both intensive and comprehensive services during the compressed summer service period, and follow up with "sending" states to ensure educational continuity for migrant children once they return to their home-base state in the fall.

Maintain the funding formula as is, but discourage the predominant use of home-based services funded through the summer adjustment. One option is to leave the current summer adjustment as is but add language to Sec. 1202 (Program Requirements) of the authorizing legislation and Subsection 201.31 (Service Priorities) of the Rules and Regulations that discourages the predominant use of home-based service to meet the needs of all eligible children in any local project. This option could moderate the incentives in the current summer adjustment to maximize the use of home study and minimize the use of campus-based instruction, while permitting flexibility and the

growth of creative service options. Together with new statutory and regulatory language that discourages predominant reliance on home-based services, the current summer adjustment could promote balanced and appropriate combinations of services in order to provide the maximum service to the largest number of eligible children and youth.

A major drawback to this option is that as more and more states extend the period during which they serve children during the summer, more summer FTEs will be generated nationwide. This increase in FTEs will in turn reduce the dollar value of an FTE and theoretically there will be a minimal gain in equity. The states with large numbers of formerly migrant children have the greatest advantage in the race to accrue summer FTEs through the provision of home-based services because formerly migrant children can be enrolled from the time regular-term instruction ends in the spring until it begins again in the fall. States with predominantly currently migrant populations could expand the time during which they provide services under this option, but they would still be limited by the migration patterns of the populations they serve (i.e., the time they spend in the state) and the speed with which local projects can identify and recruit children.

Limit the potential of selected migrant children to accrue the supplemental summer FTE for receipt of home-based instruction. Placing a cap on the proportion of time certain migrant children could accrue summer FTEs for home-based service would help make the system more equitable. For example, the funding formula could stipulate that: eligible migrant children between the ages of 5 and 15 years can accrue summer FTEs for receiving home-based instruction for a period no greater than the period of time for which they receive campus-based instruction. This stipulation would allow but not require young children (ages 3-4 years) and older youth (ages 15-21 years) to be served exclusively through home-based instruction if the SEA or local project determined it to be appropriate. However, it would limit the extent to which summer projects could use home-based instruction for school-age children (making an exception for the 15- to 18-year-olds who might have work or childcare responsibilities), the group for whom campus-based services are especially appropriate and feasible.

A summer adjustment that limits the accrual of supplemental summer FTEs for children ages 5 to 15 years who receive home-based services would: (1) continue to permit flexibility in service delivery, (2) promote programs that offer a combination of service delivery models, and (3) moderate the disparity in potential FTE accrual between states serving predominantly currently migrant children and those serving predominantly formerly migrant children.

Weaken the link between the provision of service and fund-raising that is commonly imbedded in the summer adjustment. Another approach is to weaken the link between the provision of service and fund-raising that is imbedded in the current summer adjustment and has encouraged the spread of nonintensive services as a way to boost FTE counts and raise or maintain revenues. An option for distancing instructional decisions from fund-raising concerns is to increase by some factor (e.g., double) the residency FTE count of localities providing campus-based services, whatever their duration, for a period equal to the national average length of campus-based programs (approximately 40 days [six weeks, including five weekends], according to the Cox et al., 1992). Use of the localities' peak-summer residency count could help to maximize allocations for states with summer migrant populations that rise and fall dramatically during a relatively short agricultural season.

The major benefit of this option is that it eliminates the incentive to provide the maximum number of children with the leanest type of service. This option retains the incentive for identifying, recruiting, and serving migrant children during the summer months and adds an incentive for serving children through campus-based services, at least partially. In addition, states offering campus-based services would benefit from any increases in the national average length of campus-based services, providing some incentive for programs to lengthen rather than shorten the duration of their campus-based programs.

This option would deter summer projects from some practices. It is possible that fewer children would be served (especially if there is no increase in the federal appropriation), but more likely that services would be better targeted, particularly if program regulations require that the neediest children be served well. This option would also make the provision of exclusively home-based services during the summer months highly improbable, because such programs would yield no more in FTE accrual than straight year-round residency FTEs. However, a similar adjustment could be made in the FTE accrual for localities that provide exclusively home-based or some other type of nonintensive service (perhaps using a lesser multiplier such as 1.5 times the residency FTE count).

Additional Considerations for Achieving Equitable Funding

Regardless of the option selected for modifying the summer adjustment or the effects of the summer adjustment on the provision of services, two additional considerations merit discussion.

A minimum annual funding level for all states. A minimum summer funding level would help ensure continuity of program development and maintenance throughout the year within states that receive relatively small allocations (e.g., under $1 million). For example, full-time staff could spend

time during the year coordinating with states, local agencies, and other funding sources to address some of the access problems migrant children experience regarding special education, Chapter 1, bilingual/ESL, gifted and talented, and other programs (see Chapter 2 of this report).

Consequences of making a national formula-based distinction between intensive (campus-based) and nonintensive (home-based) instruction. Home-based services have value. When they are of high quality and delivered under appropriate circumstances (as discussed earlier), home-based services can enhance a student's educational opportunity. As currently delivered, however, home-based services cost less than campus-based services. Thus, funding these different service delivery models based on their comparative costs is justifiable given the findings of this study regarding the per-pupil costs of each model and the concern for equity of funds and services across sites. However, to do so now at the national level could thwart the proliferation of alternative and flexible services that has occurred over the past five years. Given that funds generated by the provision of home-based services appear to be used in many cases to subsidize both campus-based instruction and residential camp experiences, to deny states the dollar-generating potential of home-based services would be to undermine the provision of all services.

REFERENCES

Baca, L., & Harris, K. C. (1988). Teaching migrant exceptional children. Teaching Exceptional Children,32-35.

Bogart, J. (1990). Summer school services for migrant children: Review of current literature. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Cameron, B. (1981). Comprehensive summary: Study of the ESEA Title I Migrant Education Program. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Carter, L. F. (1984, August-September). The Sustaining Effects Study of compensatory and elementary education. Educational Researcher, 4-13.

Coleman, J. S. (1982). Summer learning and school achievement. The Public Interest, 66, 140-144.

Cox, J. L., Burkheimer, G., Curtin, T. R., Rudes, B., Iachan, R., Strang, W., Carlson, E., Zarkin, G., & Dean, N. (1992). Descriptive study of the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program. Vol. 1. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Georgia Department of Education. (1990). State performance report; ECIA, Chapter 1, Migrant Program, FY 1989. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Ginsburg, A., Baker, K., Sweet, D., & Rosenthal, A. S. (1981, April). Summer learning and the effects of schocling: A replication of Heyns. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Glazer, S. M. (1989). Oral language and literacy development. In D. S. Strickland & L. M. Morrow (Eds.), Emerging literacy: Young children learn to read and write. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Guthrie, G. P., & Guthrie, L. F. (1991) Streamlining interagency collaboration for youth at risk. Educational Leadership, 49,(1), 17-22.

Hammond, P. A., & Frechtling, J. A. (1979, April). Twelve, nine and three month achievement gains of low and average achieving elementry school students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Henderson, A., Daft, J., Yen, C., & Gutmann, B. (1993). A summanry of state Chapter 1 migrant education program participation and achievement information, 1990-91. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Heyns, B. (1978). Summer learning and the effects of schooling. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Johnson, L. (1989). National identification and recruitment: Recruiter's guide. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Johnson, F. C., Levy, R. H., Morales, J. A., Morse, S. C., & Prokop, M. K. (1986). Migrant students at the secondary level: Issues and opportunities for change. Las Cruces, NM: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Klibanoff, L. S., & Haggert, S. A. (1981). Summer growth and the effectiveness of summer school. Technical report #8 from the study of the sustaining effects of compensatory education on basic skills. Santa Monica, CA: RMC Research Corporation.

Marks, E. L. (1987). Case studies of the migrant education program. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.

Migrant Student Record Transfer Service. (1991). Attachment to a letter from Troy Rinker to Francis Corrigan dated 2/4/91. Little Rock, AK.

Morrow, L. M. (1989). Designing the classroom to promote literacy development. In D. S. Strickland & L. M. Morrow (Eds.), Emerging literacy: Young children learn to read and write. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education. (1989). Services to formerly migratory children in the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program. Washington, DC: Author.

Nickse, R. S. (1990). Family and intergenerational literacy programs: An update of "the noises of literacy." Columbus, OH: Center on Education and Training for Employment, The Ohio State University.

Panton, K. L., & Rosenthal, E. D. (1991). Year-round schooling and education for the disadvantaged. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Pelavin, S. H., & David, L. (1977). Evaluating long-term achievement: An analysis of longitudinal data from compensatory education programs (Report No. EPRC 4537-15). Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute.

Piato, K. C. (1985). State education agency perspective on ECIA Chapter 1 migrant education program evaluation. Paper presented at the 69th annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Prewitt Diaz, J. O., Trotter, R. T. II, & Rivera, V. A. (1990). The effects of migration on children: An ethnographic study. Harrisburg, PA: Centro de Estudios Sobre la Migracion.

Reisner, E. R., Morrill, W. A., Chimerine, C., & Marks, E. (1991). Services Integration for At-Risk Children: A Framework for Research. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates and Mathtech.

Rivera, V. A. (1990). Migrant education program funding: Legislative perspectives and ramifications. (unpublished paper). Washington, DC.

Rudes, B. A., & Willette, J. L. (1990). Handbook of effective migrant education practices, Vol I: Findings. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.

Stallings, J. (1975). Implementation and child effects of teaching practices in Follow Through classrooms. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 40 (Serial No. 163). Cited in J. Stallings, Allocated academic learning time, or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher (1980, December).

Stallings, J., Needels, M., & Staybrook, N. (1979). The teaching of basic reading skills in secondary schools. Phase II and Phase III. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Cited in J. Stallings, Allocated academic learning time, or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher (1980, December).

Strang, E. W., & Carlson, E. (1991). Providing Chapter 1 services to limited English-proficient sudents. Rockville, MD: Westat.

Strickland, D. S. (1989). A model for change: Framework for an emergent literacy curriculum. In D. S. Strickland & L. M. Morrow (Eds.), Emerging literacy: Young children learn to read and write. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

U.S. Congress. House Committee on Education and Labor. (1978, May). Report on Education Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-561). House Rept 95-1137. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Education. (1990a). Report on the Department of Education review of Chapter 1 migrant education data. Enclosure with letter from C. E. M. Kolb to the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Committee on Appropriations, February 2, 1990. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1990b). Justifications of appropriation estimates for Committees on Appropriations, fiscal year 1990. Vol. I. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991a). Distribution of state-administered education funds. Fourteenth annual report. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991b). Justifications of appropriation estimates for Committees on Appropriations, fiscal year 1991. Vol. I. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Government Printing Office. (1980, April). Federal Register Part VI, 45(66), 68-70, 116d, 226. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Government Printing Office. (1989, October 23). Federal Register, 54(203). Washington, DC: Author.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported and advanced by many, whose contributions we would like to acknowledge.

Particular thanks go to staff at the local study sites for the work done in advance of our visits; their preparations made our data collection both easier and more enjoyable than it might have been. Furthermore, their determination to convey to us both the general nature and minute details of their summer programs facilitated our subsequent analysis.

During the course of our investigation we communicated with many state directors of migrant education who offered multiple perspectives on the complex matter under study. More specifically, directors of migrant education in the six states that hosted our site visits gave invaluable assistance, describing their programs and helping us select the sample of local projects for site visits. We thank: Tom Lugo, Migrant Education Office, California State Department of Education; Beth Arnow, Office of Migrant/ESOL Programs, Georgia State Department of Education; Cecilia Santa Ana, Migrant Education Office, Michigan State Department of Education; Jessie Montano, Office of Special Programs, Minnesota State Department of Education; Thomas Fitzgerald, Migrant Unit - Office of School Improvement Programs, New York State Department of Education; and Jerry Ortega, Migrant Education Office, Utah State Department of Education.

We would also like to thank Troy Rinker, former Director, and Cindy Kane, Senior Project Leader, of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System, both of whom answered our calls for additional information with dispatch and good humor.

For work conducted during the design phase of this study we thank Joanne Bogart and Christene Petry, formerly of PSA. The cost analysis would have been impossible without the assistance of Thomas Parrish, of the American Institutes for Research (AIR), who helped design the data collection instruments and train site visitors.

The site visitors for this study exerted unflagging effort to track down all the information needed from state, regional, and local levels to determine the true scope of services provided to migrant children at the sample sites. For their persistence we thank Margaret Hoppe of MRH Evaluation, Inc.; Lisa Richardson and Marjorie Wechsler of PSA; and Pamela Wrigley of Virginia's Migrant Education Program.

Jay Chambers, with the capable assistance of Ixtlac Duenas, both of whom are from AIR, organized and analyzed the expenditure data for this study; their analyses formed the cornerstone of this report. For their diligence, good humor, and patient mentoring we are most grateful. Brenda Turnbull and Rosalind Hamar of PSA lent moral support and provided editorial suggestions. Elizabeth Reisner stuck with us through each iteration of this report and we owe her many thanks for polishing the final result.

We are especially grateful for the patient guidance of James English, Elizabeth Farquhar, and Joanne Bogart, the study's project officers from the U.S. Department of Education.

APPENDIX A

Research Questions

1. What are the special needs for summer school services exhibited by migratory children?

   a. What are the educational needs of migratory children in summer projects?

   b. What are the noneducational needs of migratory children in summer projects?

   c. What are the special needs of subgroups of migratory children in summer projects?

   d. What differences, if any, exist in the educational and noneducational needs of currently and formerly migratory children in summer projects?

   e. To what extent are the needs of identified migrant students not met?

2. What are the characteristics of the summer school services that migratory children receive?

   a. What needs are addressed by the services?

   b. What are the educational objectives of the summer projects?

   c. What general strategies are used to achieve these objectives?

   d. In what settings are summer school services delivered?

   e. What are the intensity and duration of summer school services?

   f. What are the qualifications of summer school personnel?

   g. What strategies, if any, are used to coordinate summer school with instruction (or other activities) for migrant children during the regular school year?

   h. What are the differences in the services provided to currently and formerly migratory children?

   i. How does the summer school participation of currently migratory children differ from that of formerly migratory children?

   j. How do the characteristics of summer school services for migratory children vary across states and localities?

3. What are the costs of delivering summer school services to migratory children?

   a. What are the costs of each major component of summer school services for migratory children?

   b. What sources of funding are used to support each major component of summer school services for migratory children?

   c. What is the relationship between actual costs of summer projects for migratory children and Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program funds allocated for this purpose?

   d. How do the costs of summer school services for currently migratory children compare to those for formerly migratory children?

   e. How do the costs of summer school services for migratory children vary across states?

   f. How do the costs of summer school services for migratory children differ from the costs of services during the regular school term?

APPENDIX B

Selection of Local Sites

We selected 16 local sites from the six participating states based on ten variables, including four that emerged out of preliminary data from the Descriptive Study of the Migrant Education Program conducted by the Research Triangle Institute (Cox et al., 1992)

1. Administrative/funding structure (e.g., single school district, state regional office)
2. Number of participants
3. Grades served
4. Migratory status of participants (i.e., majority currently or formerly)
5. Total number of service days per summer term
6. Number of hours of service per week during the summer term
7. Instruction provided (e.g., math, language arts)
8. Support services provided (e.g., health, counseling)
9. Other compensatory services available
10. Location of service delivery (i.e., home-, camp-, or campus-based)

The fiscal and administrative structures of the migrant education programs within the six participating states varied greatly. Because both of these structures likely affect program costs, we paid particularly close attention to sampling this variation, both within and across states, as best we could considering the other nine selection variables. Following is a discussion of the structures within each of the six states and our sampling decisions.

Fiscal and Administrative Structures

California

The SEA awards subgrants to 18 regions, which have three administrative/funding structures. We selected six sites in California to represent the variation of fiscal/administrative structures: one direct funded site, three reimbursement sites, and two direct service sites.

(1) Direct Funding--A single school district (that is, a region is coterminous with a single district) administers the summer migrant education project using funds received directly from the state. The school district is the fiscal and administrative agent and operates with relative autonomy.

(2) Reimbursement--A single school district administers the summer migrant education project with funds that it receives from a regional state office on a reimbursement basis. The school district is the primary administrative agent (and accounts for all program funds spent locally), but the regional office retains some fiscal responsibility as the state's subgrantee. In these instances, the regional office may also provide to the school district some program services that have been determined to be more efficiently delivered on a regional basis (e.g.,

health screenings conducted by a nurse assistant). This is the most common structure in the state.

(3) Direct Service--The regional office provides services directly to a school district and accounts for all funds spent in that district. The regional office is the fiscal and administrative agent even though services may be provided in local district facilities. Some regional offices use both the direct service and reimbursement structures, depending on each local site.

Georgia

The SEA awards subgrants to four regional offices, each of which serves roughly one quarter of the state. We selected two sites in Georgia; both are regional offices. However, one of the regional programs was so large that we sampled both campus-based and home-based operations within it.

Michigan

The SEA made 42 subgrants in 1989-1990 to two different types of agencies for the purpose of providing direct services to children: (1) single school districts and (2) intermediate school districts (ISDs), which are regional offices that serve all local districts in a county. During the summer, some ISDs extend migrant education program services to migrant children in counties outside their jurisdiction who would otherwise not be served. We selected two sites in Michigan: one single school district and one ISD.

Minnesota

The SEA made 14 subgrants to local school districts to operate summer school projects in 1990. One of the districts agreed to act as the fiscal agent for a coalition of four, but each of the collaborating districts acts as its own administrative agent (e.g., hires staff, determines the content of instruction). We selected two sites in Minnesota: two of the consortium school districts, including the fiscal agent.

New York

In 1989-90, the SEA made subgrants to 12 regional summer projects that were operated by: two local school districts, four Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), and six different state university or college campuses. We selected two sites in New York: two regional projects operated by the state university system.

Utah

The SEA awards subgrants to local school districts. We selected two of the 10 summer project sites for this study.

Site Selection Data

Site	Number of Participants	Grades Served	Predominant Migrant Status	Number of Service Days	Number of Hours of Service Per Week	Instruction Provided	Support Services Provided	Other
A	426	K-12	formerly	78 dropout prog. 31 home-based (elementary) 20 local district summer school (elementary) 22 home-based (secondary) 30 local district summer school (secondary)	30 local district summer school 0.5-3.0 home-based	content-area projects, ESL/bilingual, language arts, math, PASS, reading	health, library, meals, transportation	local district summer school
B	450	preK-12, ungraded	formerly	25 preK-8, campus-based 30 secondary, campus-based 25 gifted prog. 5 outdoor prog. 25 at-risk prog. 6 education fairs	22.5 preK-8 10 secondary 70 gifted prog. 50 outdoor prog. 70 at-risk prog. 36 education fairs	adult and career education, ESL/bilingual, health and safety, language arts, math, PASS, reading, science, social studies, work study	counseling, dental, health	limited local district remedial education
C	109	K-12	formerly	30	17.5 campus-based	ESL/bilingual, language arts, math, reading	health, parent training	local district summer school
D	1,000	preK-6	formerly	25	20 campus-based	computer literacy, math, reading, writing	health	local district special education
E	350	K-8	formerly	30 campus-based 20 community-based	20 campus-based 8 community-based	bilingual/ESL, math, oral language, reading (including focus on literature)	none	local district special education
F	1,764	preK-12	formerly	30 campus-based 40 home-based	30 campus-based 1-2 home-based	art, ESL/bilingual, math, oral language, reading, spelling, writing	health, meals, parent intervention	county special education
G	326	3-year-olds, preK-9, ungraded	currently	51	20 campus-based 1.5 home-based	art, career education, ESL/bilingual, math, music, physical education, reading, vocational education, writing	meals, services for the handicapped, transportation	none

Site Selection Data

Site	Number of Participants	Grades Served	Predominant Migrant Status	Number of Service Days	Number of Hours of Service Per Week	Instruction Provided	Support Services Provided	Other
H	1,453	3-year-olds, preK-9, ungraded	currently	35 campus-based 60 home-based	20 campus-based 1.5 home-based	art, career education, computer literacy, ESL-/bilingual, language arts, math, nutrition, reading, science, social studies, vocational education	meals, services for the handicapped, transportation	Chapter 1 reading and math in one district of regional program
I	410	preK-12	currently	45	27.5 campus-based (day) 27.5 campus-based (evening) 1 home-based	art, computer literacy, ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, PASS, physical education, reading, science, social studies	dental, clothing, medical, meals, parenting, transportation	state-funded summer school
J	439	preK-12	currently	35 campus-based 30 home-based	40 campus-based (day) 17.5 campus-based (evening) 0.5 home-based	career education, cultural enhancement, ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, PASS, reading, science, social studies, physical education	daycare, dental, clothing, medical, meals, transport- ation	none
K	215	preK-12	currently	29 day program 23 evening program	40 campus-based (day) 15 campus-based (evening)	ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, physical education, reading, science, social studies	health, meals, outreach, transportation	none
L	183	preK-12	currently	30	40 campus-based	ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, physical education, reading, science, social studies	health, meals, outreach, transportation	none
M	700	K-12	currently	30	40 campus-based (day) 17.5 campus-based (evening)	career education, computer literacy, ESL/bilingual, HEP, math, mini-PASS, nutrition, PASS, reading, summer packet, swimming, theater	counseling, dental, health, meals, transportation	special education services provided by teachers in training
N	312	K-12	formerly	45 K-12 90 entering kindergartners	1 home-based	math, reading, writing	advocacy, counseling, dental, dropout prevention, health, parent education, transportation, work experience	none accessible

Site Selection Data

Site	Number of Participants	Grades Served	Predominant Migrant Status	Number of Service Days	Number of Hours of Service Per Week	Instruction Provided	Support Services Provided	Other
P	128	preK-12	formerly	39	30 campus-based	art, ESL/bilingual, math, music, oral language, reading, science, social studies, spelling, writing	dental, health, meals, transportation	none
Q	230	K-10	formerly	40	30 campus-based	art, ESL/bilingual, language arts, oral language, math, music, reading, science, social studies	dental, guidance and counseling, health, meals, social work, transportation	none

APPENDIX C

Migrant Education Program Funding History

	School Year	Authorized Level (Formula Generated)	Allocation Level	Percent of Authorized
	1966-67	$40,394,401	$ 9,737,847	24
	1967-68	41,692,425	41,692,425	100
	1968-69	45,556,074	45,556,074	100
	196970	51,014,319	51,014,319	100
	1970-71	57,608,680	57,608,680	100
	1971-72	64,822,926	64,822,926	100
	1972-73	72,776,187	72,776,187	100
	1973-74	78,331,436	78,331,436	100
a/	1974-75	91,953,160	91,953,160	100
	1975-76	97,090,478	97,090,478	100
	1976-77	130,909,832	130,909,832	100
	1977-78	145,759,940	145,759,940	100
	1978-79	173,548,829	173,548,829	100
	1979-80	209,593,746	173,548,746	100
b/	1980-81	255,802,686	245,000,000	96
	1981-82	286,541,011	266,400,000	93
c/	1982-83	336,183,521	255,744,000	76
	1983-84	367,453,919	255,744,000	70
	1984-85	428,850,219	258,024,000	60
	1985-86	449,295,429	264,524,000	59
	1986-87	476,549,363	253,149,000	53
	1987-88	532,053,309	264,524,000	50
	1988-89	596,150,980	269,029,000	45
	1989-90	742,272,858	271,700,000	37
	1990-91	845,243,225	282,444,000	33

a/ MSRTS data first used to produce FTE count

b/ First year of line item appropriation for the migrant education program

c/ State agency programs capped at 14.6 percent of the total Chapter 1 appropriation for fiscal years 1982-83 (school years 1982-83 and 1983-84)

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education

Rivera, V.A., "Migrant education program funding: Legislative perspectives and ramifications." 1990. (unpublished)

APPENDIX D

Descriptions of the Study Sites

Migrant education is a diverse program. Its diversity lies not so much in local projects' goals and objectives, nor in the educational and support service needs they address. Rather, the program's multiformity appears in different project sites' administrative structures, staffing patterns, and configurations of services and funding streams. Even the small sample of sites for this study represents a variety of approaches to serving migrant children during the summer months.

The following profiles of our 16 study sites are grouped into five categories according to their administrative and fiscal structures: (1) single school district, (2) coalition of school districts, (3) regional office of the state agency, (4) intermediate agency, and (5) university. The first category, single school district, is subdivided into operating agency and reimbursement site.

Single School District

Operating Agency

Our study sites included four single school districts that administered a migrant summer project in 1990 with funds received directly from the state in the form of subgrants:

Site Q Site Q served 277 children in grades K-10 from two school attendance areas.[1] Almost all services were paid for with Sec. 1201 funds. Migrant children rode a bus to and from the school site where they attended a full day of instruction in math, reading, other language arts, science, social studies, art/music, and physical education (including swimming lessons). Most children also learned how to use computers; many practiced on an individualized computer instruction program that was funded by Chapter 1. Youth in grades 5-12 attended vocational education classes; field trips to local businesses helped develop their career awareness. All instruction was bilingual in Spanish and English.

[1] All participation numbers come from MSRTS records of unique summer student counts, including all students ages 3-21 who produced FTE credit during the 1990 summer term.

A variety of special projects spiced up the summer school curriculum. For example, *Reading Is Fundamental* provided each child with a free book. Weekly trips to the public library supported daily reading instruction, and a local 4-H group gave a series of demonstration lessons on how to make nutritious snacks.

All migrant children who attended the Site Q summer project were provided two meals and a snack at school each day, funded by the USDA. Summer participants also received a health screening. Sec. 1201 dollars (taken off the top of the state allocation before subgrants were made) paid for the staff time, materials, and travel required to provide this service statewide.

A single recruiter found and enrolled all participants at the Site Q summer project. The project teachers spent part of their contracted time completing the necessary paperwork for the MSRTS.

Site P

Site P served 123 migrant children, in grades preK-12, from three school attendance areas. All the participants rode a bus to the single school site to participate in a full day of instruction. Elementary children studied math, reading, other language arts (including ESL), science, art/music, and physical education. (The city recreation department offered a day of free swimming lessons.) The children ate both breakfast and lunch at school, provided with funds from the USDA and other in-kind contributions.

Secondary students attended evening classes focused on reading and other language arts, physical education, and a host of vocational studies including driver's education and home economics. ESL instruction was embedded in the context-rich vocational classes. The secondary school students ate various refreshments that were produced by the home economics students and, consequently, available on an irregular basis. Site P also provided counseling services to secondary school students.

All Site P participants received a health screening during the summer. Sec. 1201 dollars (taken off the top of the state allocation before subgrants were made) paid for the staff time, materials, and travel required to provide this service statewide. In addition, Site P contracted with a local nurse to be on call for emergencies. The nurse and two volunteer interns also assisted with the general health screenings.

One recruiter was responsible for all identification and recruitment activities. Two part-time secretaries, in addition to their other responsibilities, provided support necessary to complete paperwork for the MSRTS.

Site E

Site E coordinated Sec. 1201-funded and district-funded services during the summer to maximize assistance for 635 migrant children in grades K-8. Migrant children were encouraged to participate in three different 15-day summer school sessions. The first was the district's regular summer program; Sec. 1201 funds bought transportation for those migrant children who attended the program in seven district schools. The second session was an extension of the district summer school, but for migrant children only. The third 15-day session took place at one centrally-located school and served migrant children who could get there on their own for morning classes. In the

afternoon, migrant staff visited children's homes in order to teach those who did/could not come to school in the morning. One migrant youth, hired to work as an instructional aide during the summer, was paid with Mini-Corp funds.

Twenty-five migrant children also spent a week at a residential *Outdoor Camp* where they learned about the environment through an integrated curriculum covering math, writing, drama, oral language, water safety, and nature appreciation.

Site E's support services included meals and healthcare. The district provided (through the National School Lunch Program) lunch to all children who attended the first two sessions and a snack for migrant children who came to school during the third session. Project staff served as advocates to help migrant children obtain health services available free through the state's health care program. Sec. 1201 dollars bought health services for only four children in the summer of 1990.

Site E hired a much larger, neighboring regional migrant project to conduct their identification and recruitment activities.

Site I

Site I is a single school district that served migrant children across three school attendance areas during the summer of 1990. The traditional school-based summer school involved 367 elementary and secondary school students in a full range of academic classes including math, reading and other language arts, science, social studies, and art/music. Elementary school students benefitted from migrant-funded transportation and USDA-funded breakfast, lunch, and a late-afternoon snack. The secondary school students were responsible for getting to the school-based evening classes on their own, and no meals were provided for them. PASS activities were administered through the school-based program because project staff felt the students needed close supervision and teacher contact.

In the summer of 1990, Site I pilot-tested a home-study program using instructional packets designed for independent study. The home-school liaison identified 25 children ages 4-21 who were not attending the school program but seemed to be promising candidates for the home-study approach. Site I purchased the packets from another summer migrant education project (under contract to the state to develop and disseminate home-study packets) and made two visits to each of the 25 participants: the first to deliver and explain the packets, the second to assess the results of the students' independent studies.

Health screenings and dental fluoride treatments provided through a regional migrant health clinic were available to all elementary school students who attended the school-based project. A local state college conducted vision screenings free of charge, and the county provided a nurse to visit the project site each week to handle emergencies and provide other necessary services. Sec. 1201 funds paid for one staff person to coordinate all the health services; she was primarily an advocate and health service broker.

A Youth Employment Program, funded under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), paid the summer salaries of six former migrant students. They worked as classroom aides, assisting the teachers with instructional activities.

A full-time home-school liaison conducted all identification and recruitment activities. A records clerk entered all student data into the MSRTS.

Reimbursement Site

Three study sites were associated with regional offices of the SEA to the extent that the regional offices were the operating agencies to which the state subgranted money; the regional offices then reimbursed the sites for program expenses. The three sites also benefitted from a few services provided by the regional migrant education project; however, key administrative and instructional decisions (e.g., staffing, transportation, student grouping) were made at the district level. The school district was essentially the locus of administrative control.

Site A

Site A is part of a regional migrant education program. The regional office of the SEA handles all MSRTS paperwork for Site A and other sites in the region; it also provides a modicum of supervisory assistance, but Site A hires its own staff and designs the configuration of services provided to migrant children during the summer. The regional office reimburses Site A for project expenses.

Site A served 463 migrant children, prekindergarten through grade 12 (and including dropouts), during the summer of 1990. Home-based instruction reached all participants, providing small-group instruction for about 30 minutes a week per child. Thus, a weekly session for a family with four eligible children lasted about two hours. Project tutors taught from instructional packets designed to provide practice in the basic skills of language arts (including ESL) and math.

Just over 370 participants also attended the district-funded summer school (during which time the home-based instruction ceased for them), the majority arriving and departing each day on buses funded with Sec. 1201 funds. These participants ate lunch at school; the meals were provided by the district with funds from the National School Lunch Program. Sec. 1201 funds supported a prekindergarten program for migrant 4-year-olds at the school site.

Site staff targeted a host of additional special services to children whom they felt would most likely benefit from them. For example, four children spent five full days at an overnight *Outdoor Camp* where they studied flora and fauna of the sea, survival skills, and nature appreciation--all to help them develop their self-esteem and study ESL in a context-rich environment. Project Best was a three-week residential program for selected children in grades 9-11, located at the state university, that provided individualized academic tutoring, mentoring in college planning, and

leadership training. A *Leadership Program* engaged migrant youth, in grades 7-12, and their parents in a full day of presentations focused on elevating the students' aspirations to higher education and de-mystifying the college experience.

Two Mini-Corps students assisted with the 1990 summer project. Identification and recruitment of migrant children plus MSRTS paperwork were conducted jointly by the regional office and one on-site staff member.

Site C

Site C enrolled 53 migrant children, in grades preK-7, in migrant-funded summer school to study reading, other language arts, and math. Bilingual instructional aides helped teach LEP students; one Mini-Corps student served as an in-class instructional aide. An additional 13 migrant children attended the district-funded summer school. All participating migrant children had access to migrant-funded transportation and a daily lunch funded by the USDA.

Three different residential camp experiences were available to a selected number of children from each site, including Site C, through the regional migrant education project. Each site paid a fee for its children to attend. The various *Outdoor Camps* offered a curriculum of nature appreciation, sea life, and survival skills.

Site C is on a three-year cycle for health screenings provided by a nurse through the regional office. In 1990, all 59 children received a complete physical by the regional nurse as well as a dental screening provided by a volunteer dentist. In the rare cases when Sec. 1201 funds were used to buy health services, migrant parents made a contribution based on a sliding scale according to their income.

Migrant-funded support service aides at the district level performed all identification and recruitment activities. The aides also performed advocacy work to ensure that children and their families gained access to all the appropriate community services available to them.

Site D

Site D served a total of 1,267 migrant children through a host of summer activities funded by a variety of sources. Children in grades preK-6 attended the traditional summer program in three school buildings; they studied mathematics, reading and other language arts (including ESL), science, social studies, and art/music through thematic units that integrated all the subject areas. Bus transportation and lunch were provided daily, the former with Sec. 1201 funds, the latter through reimbursement from the USDA. One Mini-Corps student assisted with project activities. An additional 67 migrant children attended the district's summer school program.

The *Lyceum Program* targeted selected migrant children in grades 2-6 for participation in a special program for gifted students. A local community agency ran the program, and the regional migrant office paid the required fee for each participating migrant child from Site D.

Two different one-week residential camp programs combined recreational activities with an academic curriculum to teach migrant children about their outdoor environment. Both the *YMCA Camp* and the *Walden West Camp* were subsidized

through other sources, but required a per child participation fee which was paid with Sec. 1201 funds through the regional migrant project.

The *Toro Day Camp*, sponsored by the Girl Scouts, provided 13 days of outdoor education for another group of migrant children; Sec. 1201 dollars paid only for their daily transportation to and from the camp. The Girl Scouts also operated the *Healthy Kids Club*, a four-week nutrition and preventive health education program for 60-75 Site D migrant children.

The *Parent Preschool Program* met for 20 evenings during the summer. Migrant children, ages 3-4 years, attended with their parents to participate in "Home-School Partnership Training," a curriculum designed to teach parenting skills.

Two separate *Yo Puedo* (translation: I am able) programs furnished residential academic experiences for a selected group of Site D migrant children in grades 5-6. The children roomed at either a local community college or a local campus of the state university and attended a variety of academic classes and campus activities for 2-4 weeks. Per participant fees were paid with Sec. 1201 funds through the regional migrant project.

During the summer of 1990, no Sec. 1201 funds were spent on health services. Site D staff, acting as advocates, saw that children in need of care received appropriate services through the state's health care program or other sources.

Identification and recruitment during the summer was conducted by two clerical aides and three school community coordinators funded with Sec. 1201 monies at the district level. The regional project office provided support to enter student data into the MSRTS.

Coalition of School Districts

Two study sites belonged to a coalition of four districts; one district agreed to serve as the fiscal agent--or operating agency--to which the state subgrants Sec. 1201 funds. However, each of the four districts has maintained its own administrative structure to hire and deploy personnel, recruit and transport children, etc. The two sites were:

Site K

Site K is part of a coalition of four school districts that receives one subgrant from the state to serve migrant children during the summer. Although Site K is the fiscal agent, each of the four districts maintains its own administrative structure to hire staff, provide transportation, and the like.

Site K's traditional school-based project served 180 migrant children in grades preK-12. The elementary school children attended a full day of instruction in math, reading

and other language arts (including library time), science, social studies, music, physical education, and health. ESL instruction was provided during pull-out tutoring sessions. Secondary school students attended an evening class to receive instruction in math, reading, and oral English. Vocational education and ESL instruction were provided on an as-needed basis. Junior high school students also had access to computer instruction.

The school district rented school buses to the migrant project at a reduced rate so all migrant children (including 100 preschoolers attending the migrant Head Start program at the same site) could ride to and from school each day. Breakfast, lunch, and a late afternoon snack were provided daily to elementary school children; all secondary school students were provided a meal each evening. The USDA reimbursed Site K for all costs associated with the meals.

In this state, identification and recruitment activities and MSRTS-related paperwork are conducted statewide by one agency that receives a subgrant from the state for that purpose. As part of its contract with the state, the agency also addresses health needs. At the Site K summer project, all the participants received a medical and dental screening purchased with Sec. 1201 funds through this agency.

Site L

Site L is another member of the coalition of four school districts for which Site K is the fiscal agent. Like the others it has its own administrative structure. The 1990 summer project served 145 migrant children in grades preK-8. Students study reading, math, Spanish language and Mexican culture, music, art, and physical education (including swimming). Computers were available, and a study period was scheduled into the school day.

Sec. 1201 monies were used to rent buses from the local district to transport migrant children to and from school. Breakfast, lunch, and a late afternoon snack are part of the daily offerings. The USDA reimbursements covered almost all the costs of providing meals.

Like Site K, its neighboring project, Site L benefits from the state's contract with an independent agency that handles all identification and recruitment activities, MSRTS paperwork, and health services. In the summer of 1990, all participating children received a medical and dental screening through this agency.

Regional Office of the SEA

Site B

Site B is a local site operated by migrant staff at a regional office of the SEA that provides direct service to a number of sites within the region. During the summer 1990 term, Site B served a total of 643 migrant children through a combination of school-based and home-based instruction. Almost two-thirds of the participants received both types of instruction. The rest participated in the home-study portion only.

Migrant children who attended the school-based program received integrated instruction in reading and other language arts, math, social studies, science, art, and music. A selected and much smaller group of secondary school youth attended a study hall each afternoon where they received individual tutoring from project staff. A combination of Mini-Corps and JTPA funds paid the salaries of a number of young adults who worked as instructional aides in the classrooms. Sec. 1201 monies were used to rent the school buses that transported most of the participating children, and to buy city transit vouchers for about 40 others. USDA funded a daily breakfast and lunch for all the traditional summer school participants and lunch only for the study hall students.

The home-study program engaged migrant children in small group instruction at home with their siblings once each week. Project staff used instructional packets designed by the regional office to provide practice in basic skills and help students maintain their skill level throughout the summer when school was not in session. In between teacher visits the students worked independently through the instructional activities in the packets.

A selected group of migrant children spent five days and nights at an *Outdoor Education Camp* where they studied the flora and fauna of the sea, survival skills, and nature appreciation. The camp was funded through the state Mini-Corp program; project funds paid the per child fee for each of its participants. Another group of secondary school students attended a one-day *Leadership Symposium* where they listened to speakers exhort them to set their sights on college and ambitious career goals.

At Site B, all kindergarten children were screened for inoculations. In addition, staff screened each student's MSRTS record and notified parents of any special problems that needed attention. Site B hosted a number of health education events, including a presentation about personal hygiene. Project staff helped 13 migrant children obtain the free services available to them through the state's healthcare program. Minimal Sec. 1201 funds were expended for direct medical services during the summer of 1990.

Community outreach workers (including some Mini-Corps students) identified and recruited students, and then acted as instructors for the home-study packet program.

Site F

Site F is a local site operated by a regional office of the SEA. Roughly 1,772 migrant children attended during the summer of 1990; many participated in more than one of the project components which included school-based activities, independent home study, and other special services. Almost 500 additional migrant children attended the district-funded summer school; some of them also received minimal support services from the migrant education project.

The traditional school-based program presented students with instruction in reading, other language arts, and mathematics, with social studies and limited science activities integrated throughout. Mini-Corps and the *Student Youth Employment Program*, funded under JTPA, together paid the salaries of over 30 young adults who assisted in

classrooms as instructional aides. Sec. 1201 funds were used to transport children to and from the school site. Breakfast and lunch, provided with funds from USDA, were a routine part of each student's school day.

The independent home-study program reached almost 60 percent of the participants when the school-based program was not in session. Project staff visited the children's homes twice each week to involve them in small group instruction aimed at (1) providing practice in the basic skills of reading and math, and (2) motivating students to explore literature through a variety of trade books and pre- and post-reading activities. Migrant children were then responsible for independently completing additional schoolwork between tutorial sessions. The home-study tutors used instructional packets designed by project staff. A particular set of packets helped junior high school students prepare for the state proficiency exams. High school students enrolled in the PASS program completed their coursework under the guidance of the home-study tutors.

Site F offered a special work-study program for a selected group of secondary school migrant youth who were both credit deficient and in need of financial assistance. The youths worked three hours each day in the private sector (e.g., at a doctor's office, bank, etc.) and participated in the independent home-study program by enrolling in one or more PASS courses. Project staff also enrolled a small group of migrant youth who had dropped out of school in a GED class sponsored by a local community college; the students attended at no cost to the migrant education project.

The *Outdoor Education Camp* provided a unique opportunity to a selected group of secondary school students. They attended a week-long overnight camp where they studied flora and fauna of the sea, survival skills, and nature appreciation.

A local community college offered *La Familia*, a family education program, to willing migrant children and their parents. Sec. 1201 funds paid for transportation only; the college sponsored everything else.

Project staff served as advocates to avail migrant children of free health services offered through the state's healthcare program. A minimal amount of Sec. 1201 funds were expended to provide needed services after other funding sources had been investigated and found inadequate.

Four support service aides at the site level performed all identification and recruitment activities and MSRTS paperwork under the supervision of a regional project staff member.

Site G

Site G is a regional project responsible for meeting the needs of migrant children in a region that covers 20 local school districts. During the 1990 summer term, Site G served 324 children, in grades preK-9, from six of the 20 districts through a combination of contract services (independent home study) and a school-based program. Sec. 1201 funds paid for all project services except meals, which were paid for with reimbursement from the USDA.

Migrant children who attended the school-based program rode a bus to and from school and ate two meals a day there. All participants studied mathematics, reading, ESL (as needed), art/music, and physical education. Youth in grades 6-9 also received some vocational education instruction.

The focus of the home-study program was family education. Families that enrolled in the program signed a contract with the migrant education project agreeing to participate in weekly instructional sessions (approximately one and a half hours per session) provided at their homes by project staff, and to see that their children completed some independent academic work each week. Instruction aimed at improving the children's reading, oral language, and math skills. Most of the participating families also went on a migrant-sponsored field trip during the summer. Selected children attended *Space Camp*, spending one week at a NASA facility to learn about space exploration.

Minimal medical and dental services were provided to participating children. All identification and recruitment activities were conducted at the regional level by two outreach workers.

Site H

Site H is a regional migrant education project with a jurisdiction covering 18 school districts. During the summer of 1990, it served over 1,435 migrant children, ages 3-21, through a combination of home- and school-based services. Sec. 1201 funds paid for all project services except meal costs, which were funded by USDA. An additional 20 migrant children attended a Chapter 1-funded summer school in one of the 18 districts that provided remedial instruction in language arts and mathematics.

Children attending the school-based program had access to migrant-funded bus transportation to and from school. At school, the children studied mathematics, reading and other language arts, art/music, physical education, and career awareness. Upper elementary and secondary school youth also received instruction in science and social studies. Word-processing skills were part of the summer school curriculum for all participants. Special instruction in proper nutrition was offered to children in grades 4-8; two meals a day, paid for through USDA, were available for all participants.

Home-based (or contract) services were provided to formerly migratory children to help them maintain their skill level during the summer recess. Project staff developed a study contract with each student based on the regular-term classroom teacher's recommendations concerning students' strengths and weaknesses. The participating children then spent roughly one hour each week engaged in instructional activities with visiting project staff, supplemented with additional time spent on independent study activities.

Medical and dental services were provided to participating children as needed, which resulted in almost 30 children receiving health-related services funded with Sec. 1201 funds in the summer term of 1990.

Two regional office staff were responsible for all identification and recruitment activity as well as MSRTS paperwork.

Intermediate Agency

Site J

Site J is a regional migrant education project operated by an intermediate school district. During the summer of 1990, the project served approximately 435 migrant children, grades preK-12 from four counties, with a combination of school- and home-based services. The school-based program operated in four buildings and focused on math, reading and other language arts, science, and social studies. The classroom teachers took turns teaching gym class; only the prekindergarten students received instruction in art and music. Breakfast, lunch, and a late afternoon snack were available daily to all children; USDA reimbursement covered roughly 75 percent of the costs of foodstuffs and preparation; Sec. 1201 paid the balance. Ten secondary school youth worked as instructional aides; their salaries came from the JTPA program. Migrant education funds paid for bus transportation for all children attending the school-based summer project.

Roughly 75 percent of the participating children also received home-study packets designed to reinforce academic skills during a period when the school-based program was not in session. Project staff visited the students' homes three times during the six-week period. The first visit was to pretest the students to determine their achievement levels and to assign packets based on the assessment results. The second visit was to monitor student progress in working through the packet and to provide any needed assistance. The third visit was to administer the posttest.

An infant daycare program, jointly funded by federal Title XX and state funds from the Department of Social Services (DSS), served 72 migrant children ages 2 weeks to 3 years. The daycare program was closely coordinated with the migrant education program. Both operated out of the same facility, and a portion of the Title XX dollars co-funded the salaries of preschool staff serving 3- and 4-year-olds.

Dental screenings were available from a nearby migrant health center for all children who attended the school-based program. All children under age 5 received a complete physical for which the DSS reimbursed the migrant education project $12 per child; A combination of Sec. 1201 funds and private donations paid the balance. In addition, children at one of the four school sites benefitted from vision and hearing screenings, provided free of charge by a local health agency. In all cases, the migrant project staff worked to identify and avail migrant children of these health services.

Four recruiters--one for each of the four counties--did all the summer identification and recruitment. One MSRTS clerk/secretary in each of the four counties completed the MSRTS paperwork.

University

Site M

The Site M regional migrant project is operated by the state university. Its service region covers 47 local school attendance areas. During the summer of 1990, Site M served over 661 migrant children through a combination of school-based and home-based instruction with an emphasis on developmental appropriateness. During the school-based program, elementary school children studied integrated language arts and mathematics each morning, followed by instruction in science, drama, computer literacy, and swimming in the afternoon.

Secondary school students attended night class. They were placed in one of four different curriculum tracks (e.g., ESL, high school course completion) based on an individual needs assessment that may have included a telephone call to the student's home school in Texas or Florida.

Participants who attended the day and evening school-based programs had access to migrant-funded transportation. Elementary school children ate three meals a day at school; the secondary school students who attended the night program were provided a snack. USDA reimbursements covered all costs associated with meals.

The home-study program provided participants with some academic activities both before and after the traditional summer school. Students worked independently at home, assisted by a weekly visit from a project tutor.

A small selected group of migrant youth also attended a *Summer Leadership Conference*, an overnight camp experience during which they attend academic seminars and motivational presentations.

A nurse on the migrant education project's summer staff screened all students' MSRTS health records to determine needs for follow-up care. Over 15 students received a physical examination or dental services, paid for with migrant funds through another university within the state that receives a Sec. 1201 subgrant to provide all health services. The subgrantee also conducts all identification and recruitment activities for the state. The Site M summer project employs a full-time records clerk to maintain all other paperwork for the MSRTS and the state's own student tracking system.

Two additional funding sources augmented Site M's summer project. Twelve students worked in various capacities for the summer migrant education project, paid for through a summer employment program funded under JTPA. Migrant Head Start offered daycare for migrant children ages 2 weeks to 2 years.

Site N

Site N is a regional project, operated by a campus of the state university, that served 378 migrant children from 31 school attendance areas during the summer of 1990. All participants received one-to-one tutoring assistance geared to their individual needs in reading, mathematics, writing, and career exploration. After the students signed a

contract to complete certain assignments during the summer term, project tutors visited their homes weekly to provide tutorial assistance and to monitor their progress.

Additional summer activities included visits to the local public libraries and children's theater. Participating adolescents took field trips to the college and local businesses. Ten youth attended a *Summer Leadership Conference*, sponsored by the state migrant education office with Sec. 1201 funds.

Sec. 1201 funds are used to provide health services statewide on an as-needed basis. Another university in the state receives a Sec. 1201 subgrant for the purpose of reimbursing local projects for health-related costs incurred only after all other funding avenues have been investigated and found inadequate. During the 1990 summer term, a total of 16 migrant children participating in the Site N project received migrant-funded medical and dental care.

The same university that handled all health issues also conducted identification and recruitment activities. A records clerk hired by the Site N project completed other paperwork for the MSRTS and the state's own student tracking system.

APPENDIX E

Amount and Percent of Total Expenditures by Cost Area and Site

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
A	Direct Instruction	$ 21,871.58	30.97
	Instructional Support	4,431.57	6.28
	Admin. & Support	25,753.68	36.47
	Recruit & Outreach	5,729.49	8.11
	Transportation	6,980.00	9.88
	Food Services	370.00	0.52
	Camp Prog. (Enrich.)	5,482.00	7.76
	TOTAL	$ 70,618.32	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials, office for coordinator
- CHDPP - health costs for 4 students
- Public Library - parent training session
- YMCA - afternoon recreation program for 2-3 students
- Boy Scouts - waived fee for one child to attend camp ($140)

B	Direct Instruction	$ 71,873.77	39.52
	Instructional Support	330.98	0.18
	Admin. & Support	49,058.24	26.98
	Recruit & Outreach	12,689.04	6.98
	Custodial	1,757.24	0.97
	Transportation	15,907.00	8.75
	Health	6,445.00	3.54
	Food Services	20,519.00	11.28
	Camp Prog. (Enrich.)	3,265.00	1.80
	TOTAL	$181,845.27	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials
- Police, ambulance, and drug abuse prevention - one-day presentations for the students
- College student and parents - volunteer in classrooms

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
C	Direct Instruction	$ 6,246.57	40.60
	Instructional Support		
	Admin. & Support	4,729.72	30.74
	Recruit & Outreach	1,282.03	8.33
	Transportation	1,064.00	6.92
	Health	254.00	1.65
	Food Services	1,211.00	7.87
	Camp Prog. (Enrich.)	597.68	3.88
	TOTAL	$ 15,385.00	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials

D	Direct Instruction	$134,005.24	37.85
	Instructional Support	26,777.79	7.56
	Admin. & Support	84,538.50	23.88
	Recruit & Outreach	5,866.56	1.66
	Custodial	3,514.48	0.99
	Transportation	10,433.00	2.95
	Health	.00	.00
	Food Services	34,230.00	9.67
	Camp Prog. (Enrich.)	54,675.00	15.44
	TOTAL	$354,040.57	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials
- Girl Scouts - sponsored Healthy Kids Club (60-75 students, 3 hrs./day for 4 weeks); sponsored TORO day camp (13 days of outdoor ed. for 117 students)
- TRIAD - co-sponsored gifted program
- Community agency - supplied teachers, materials, lodging for 33 students to attend a 4-week pre-college camp
- CHDPP - screened all students

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
E	Direct Instruction	$ 47,118.37	31.29
	Instructional Support	21,507.28	14.28
	Admin. & Support	49,576.87	32.93
	Recruit & Outreach	10,200.00	6.77
	Custodial	1,397.01	0.93
	Transportation	7,058.00	4.69
	Health	217.00	0.14
	Food Services	11,219.00	7.45
	Camp Prog. (Enrich.)	2,210.00	1.47
	Other (student insurance)	68,000.05	
	TOTAL	$150,571.53	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials
- District - shares transportation costs
- Local doctors & dentists - services at reduced fee

F	Direct Instruction	$220,972.81	50.67
	Instructional Support	20,945.05	4.80
	Admin. & Support	107,254.67	24.59
	Recruit & Outreach	17,036.44	3.91
	Custodial	5,342.01	1.22
	Transportation	15,722.00	3.60
	Health	4,947.79	1.13
	Food Services	22,537.73	5.17
	Camp Prog. (Enrich.)	10,420.00	2.39
	Other (workstudy)	10,950.00	2.51
	TOTAL	$436,123.50	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- County library - mobile library visits school to check books out to children
- Local college - parent training program; HEP program
- CHDPP and contributions - $21,000 in medical services

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
G	Direct Instruction	$ 40,115.85	47.29
	Instructional Support	4,137.45	4.88
	Admin. & Support	19,582.19	23.08
	Recruit & Outreach	12,330.37	14.53
	Custodial	948.91	1.12
	Transportation	1,494.58	1.76
	Health	unknown	--
	Food Services	6,228.00	7.34
	TOTAL	$ 84,837.35	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- Local bank - donated swimming lessons
- Churches and civic organizations - donated food and clothing upon request

---

H *	Direct Instruction	$176,823.74	54.39
	Instructional Support	16,982.59	5.22
	Admin. & Support	38,100.16	11.72
	Recruit & Outreach	21,268.24	6.54
	Custodial	3,066.39	0.94
	Transportation	25,444.11	7.83
	Health	6,205.87	1.91
	Food Services	34,181.71	10.52
	Daycare	873.00	0.27
	Other (tuition for space camp)	2,129.00	0.65
	TOTAL	$325,074.81	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- YMCA & church - donated swimming classes
- Home-extension Service - conducted nutrition class
- Amer. Dental Assoc. - provided dental supplies
- Churches - food bank and clothing
- Three classroom volunteers

* Numbers are extrapolated, based on home-based enrollment of 931 and school-based enrollment of 700. Actual breakdowns for service delivery system for total project were not available.

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
I	Direct Instruction	$173,691.95	64.63
	Instructional Support	7,129.40	2.65
	Admin. & Support	54,877.05	20.42
	Recruit & Outreach	6,402.58	2.38
	Transportation	12,168.00	4.53
	Health	3,793.38	1.41
	Food Services	9,666.00	3.60
	Other (audit)	1,000.00	0.37
	TOTAL	$268,728.36	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - nominal fee for use of school facilities and some materials
- State college - vision screenings for 105 students
- Migrant Health Clinic - dental screenings for 105 students
- County health department - hearing screenings for 105 students

J	Direct Instruction	$199,819.98	43.69
	Instructional Support	21,066.47	4.61
	Admin. & Support	100,876.16	22.06
	Recruit & Outreach	17,128.56	3.75
	Custodial	2,706.15	0.59
	Transportation	62,840.87	13.74
	Health	13,583.61	2.97
	Food Services	36,341.00	7.95
	Other (insurance, audit, fieldtrip, storage)	2,971.00	0.65
	TOTAL	$457,333.80	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- State Friends of Education - free books
- Police/Fire - student assembly
- Community agency - presentation about self-esteem
- Community agencies - clothing
- Boy/Girl Scouts - activities, 2-3 times/week

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
K	Direct Instruction	$ 29,809.07	26.22
	Instructional Support	4,682.84	4.12
	Admin. & Support	19,528.15	17.17
	Recruit & Outreach	7,522.15	6.62
	Custodial	2,038.40	1.79
	Transportation	30,584.47	26.90
	Health	6,483.70	5.70
	Food Services	11,320.00	9.96
	Extracurricular	486.00	0.43
	Other (audit, insurance, phone)	1,254.00	1.10
	TOTAL	$113,708.78	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school and some materials; balance of transportation costs; travel, phone, supplies for regional coordinator not billed to MEP
- Parents - volunteers during presentation on prevention of child abuse
- Video store - lent vidoes free of charge

L	Direct Instruction	$ 28,606.69	30.45
	Instructional Support	4,699.63	5.00
	Admin. & Support	16,965.77	18.06
	Recruit & Outreach	4,138.02	4.41
	Custodial	2,548.00	2.71
	Transportation	16,005.28	17.04
	Health	5,488.26	5.84
	Food Services	13,978.00	14.88
	Extracurricular	250.00	0.27
	Other (insurance, audit)	1,254.00	1.33
	TOTAL	$93,933.65	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school and some materials; balance of transportation costs; travel, phone, supplies for regional coordinator not billed to MEP

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
M	Direct Instruction	$162,560.92	44.70
	Instructional Support	14,241.04	3.92
	Admin. & Support	101,184.23	27.82
	Recruit & Outreach	22,436.73	6.17
	Transportation	29,650.00	8.15
	Health	5,917.94	1.63
	Food Services	25,588.00	7.04
	Other (leadership conf.)	2,110.00	0.58
	TOTAL	$363,688.86	100.00

In-Kind:

- University and school - use of facilities and some materials
- Community - food bank
- Sororities - host parent meeting parties
- Girl Scouts - conduct scout meetings 2 hrs./week
- Migrant Health - paid for physical examinations for three students
- Community - helped repair fire damage

N	Direct Instruction	$ 54,992.35	48.14
	Instructional Support	3,618.06	3.17
	Admin. & Support	33,569.60	29.39
	Recruit & Outreach	19,497.70	17.07
	Transportation	120.00	0.11
	Health	727.00	0.64
	Food Services	250.00	0.22
	Other (leadership conf.)	1,452.00	1.27
	TOTAL	$114,226.71	100.00

In-Kind:

- University - use of facilities
- Churches and student groups - clothing

Site	Cost Area	Amount	Percent
P	Direct Instruction	$ 34,898.20	40.21
	Instructional Support	3,370.99	3.88
	Admin. & Support	14,683.81	16.92
	Recruit & Outreach	7,760.81	8.94
	Transportation	9,669.64	11.14
	Health	2,464.00	2.84
	Food Services	7,598.00	8.75
	Other (support person)	6,340.00	7.31
	TOTAL	$ 86,785.45	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials; waived fee for student to attend district summer school to make up credit
- Parents and foster grandparent - volunteer assistance in class and on fieldtrips
- City - swimming lessons
- Medical interns - screen children free of charge
- Elks Lodge and other community agencies - clothing

Q	Direct Instruction	$ 49,226.51	42.13
	Instructional Support	1,189.83	1.02
	Admin. & Support	26,549.35	22.72
	Recruit & Outreach	5,197.23	4.45
	Custodial	2,113.08	1.81
	Transportation	11,118.51	9.52
	Health	2,195.00	1.88
	Food Services	18,422.00	15.77
	Other (swimming, sub. teachers)	840.00	0.72
	TOTAL	$116,851.51	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials
- 4-H program - presentation about nutrition
- RIF - gave books to each student
- Local leather shop - demonstration lesson and presentation

APPENDIX F

Amount and Percent of Total Expenditures by Funding Source and Site

Site	Funding Source	Amount	Percent
A	Chapter 1 Migrant	$ 70,248.32	99.48
	USDA	370.00	0.52
	TOTAL	$ 70,618.32	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities, office for coordinator
- CHDPP - health costs for 4 students
- Public Library - parent training session
- YMCA - afternoon recreation program for 2-3 students
- Boy Scouts - waived fee for one child to attend camp ($140)

B	JTPA	$ 7,039.00	3.87
	Chapter 1 Migrant	151,102.27	83.09
	USDA	20,519.00	11.28
	Other (Reading is Fundamental)	3,185.00	1.75
	TOTAL	$181,845.27	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities
- Police, ambulance, and drug abuse prevention - one-day presentations for the students
- College student and parents - volunteer in classrooms

Site	Funding Source	Amount	Percent
C	Chapter 1 Basic	$ 1,016.72	6.61
	General State & Local	1,019.46	6.63
	Chapter 1 Migrant	10,273.83	66.78
	State Categorical	1,796.21	11.68
	USDA	1,211.00	7.87
	Other	67.70	0.44
	TOTAL	$ 15,385.00	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials

D	Title VII	$ 351.38	0.10
	Chapter 1 Basic	3,147.37	0.89
	General State & Local	5,882.23	1.66
	Chapter 1 Migrant	298,746.93	84.38
	State Categorical	9,774.14	2.76
	USDA	34,230.00	9.67
	Other	1,908.52	0.54
	TOTAL	$354,040.57	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials
- Girl Scouts - sponsored Healthy Kids Club (60-75 students, 3 hrs./day for 4 weeks); sponsored TORO day camp (13 days of outdoor ed. for 117 students)
- TRIAD - co-sponsored gifted program
- Community agency - supplied teachers, materials, lodging for 33 students to attend a 4-week pre-college camp
- CHDPP - screened all students

Site	Funding Source	Amount	Percent
E	General State & Local	$ 33,268.17	22.09
	Chapter 1 Migrant	106,084.36	70.45
	USDA	11,219.00	7.45
	TOTAL	$150,571.53	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials
- District - shares transportation costs
- Local doctors & dentists - services at reduced fee

F	JTPA	$ 33,728.00	7.73
	Chapter 1 Migrant	379,862.77	87.10
	USDA	22,532.73	5.17
	TOTAL	$436,123.50	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- County library - mobile library visits school to check books out to children
- Local college - parent training program; HEP program
- CHDPP and contributions - $21,000 in medical services

G	Chapter 1 Migrant	$ 76,237.31	89.25
	USDA	5,678.00	6.65
	Other	3,502.04	4.10
	TOTAL	$ 85,417.35	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- Local bank - donated swimming lessons
- Churches and civic organizations - donated food and clothing upon request

Site	Funding Source	Amount	Percent
H *	Chapter 1 Migrant	$296,026.55	91.06
	USDA	29,048.26	8.94
	TOTAL	$325,074.81	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- YMCA & church - donated swimming classes
- Home-extension Service - conducted nutrition class
- Amer. Dental Assoc. - provided dental supplies
- Churches - food bank and clothing

* Numbers are extrapolated, based on home-based enrollment of 931 and school-based enrollment of 700. We did not have the actual breakdown of numbers of students by service delivery system for the total project.

I	JTPA	$ 4,620.00	1.72
	Chapter 1 Migrant	254,442.36	94.68
	USDA	9,666.00	3.60
	TOTAL	$268,728.36	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - nominal fee for use of school facilities and some materials
- State college - vision screenings for 105 students
- Migrant Health Clinic - dental screenings for 105 students
- County health department - hearing screenings for 105 students

J	JTPA	$ 10,366.00	2.27
	Chapter 1 Migrant	408,730.80	89.37
	USDA	36,341.00	7.95
	Other (Dep. of Soc. Ser.)	1,896.00	0.41
	TOTAL	$457,333.80	100.00

In-Kind:

- Districts - use of school facilities and some materials
- State Friends of Education - free books
- Police/Fire - student assembly
- Community agency - presentation about self-esteem
- Community agencies - clothing
- Boy/Girl Scouts - activities, 2-3 times/week

Site	Funding Source	Amount	Percent
K	Chapter 1 Migrant	$102,388.78	90.04
	USDA	11,320.00	9.96
	TOTAL	$113,708.78	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school and some materials; balance of transportation costs; travel, phone, supplies for regional coordinator not billed to MEP
- Parents -volunteers during presentation on prevention of child abuse
- Video store - lent vidoes free of charge

L	Chapter 1 Migrant	$ 79,955.65	85.12
	USDA	13,978.00	14.88
	TOTAL	$ 93,933.65	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school and some materials; balance of transportation costs; travel, phone, supplies for regional coordinator not billed to MEP

M	JTPA	$ 6,030.00	1.66
	Chapter 1 Migrant	329,516.39	90.60
	USDA	25,588.00	7.04
	Other	2,554.47	0.70
	TOTAL	$363,688.86	100.00

In-Kind:

- University and school - use of facilities and some materials
- Community - food bank
- Sororities - host parent meeting parties
- Girl Scouts - conduct scout meetings 2 hrs./week
- Migrant Health - paid for physical examinations for three students
- Community - helped repair fire damage

Site	Funding Source	Amount	Percent
N	University	$ 8,552.90	7.49
	Chapter 1 Migrant	105,673.81	92.51
	TOTAL	$114,226.71	100.00

In-Kind:

- University - use of facilities
- Churches and student groups - clothing

P	General State & Local	$ 300.00	0.35
	Chapter 1 Migrant	79,187.45	91.25
	USDA	7,298.00	8.41
	TOTAL	$ 86,785.45	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials; waived fee for student to attend district summer school to make up credit
- Parents and foster grandparent - volunteer assistance in class and on fieldtrips
- City - swimming lessons
- Medical interns - screen children free of charge
- Elks Lodge and other community agencies - clothing

Q	Chapter 1 Basic	$ 11,468.57	9.81
	General State & Local	3,262.00	2.79
	Chapter 1 Migrant	82,198.94	70.34
	USDA	18,422.00	15.77
	Other (Chapter 2)	1,500.00	1.28
	TOTAL	$116,851.51	100.00

In-Kind:

- District - use of school facilities and some materials
- 4-H program - presentation about nutrition
- RIF - gave books to each student
- Local leather shop - demonstration lesson and presentation

APPENDIX G

Sample Per Pupil Cost Profile

Campus-based Per Pupil Cost for Site A

Cost Category	Personnel	Nonpersonnel	Combination Per. & Nonper.	Total
Direct Instruction	$103.48			
Supplies, Materials, & Equipment		1.62		
Instructional Support	9.57			
Administration & Support	27.00		19.26	
Supplies, Materials, & Equipment		0.46		
Rent, Maintenance, Operations, & Utilities		0.30		
Travel		0.94		
Indirect Costs		7.66		
Outreach & Recruitment	7.55		4.82	
Food Services			37.00	
Transportation Services			23.34	
TOTAL	147.60	10.98	84.42	$243.00

Home-based Per Pupil Cost for Site A

Cost Category	Personnel	Nonpersonnel	Combination Per. & Nonper.	Total
Direct Instruction	$ 43.17			
Supplies, Materials, & Equipment		3.06		
Travel & Conferences		1.79		
Instructional Support	9.57			
Administration & Support	27.00		19.26	
Supplies, Materials, & Equipment		0.46		
Travel		0.94		
Indirect Costs		7.66		
Outreach & Recruitment	7.55	4.82		
TOTAL	87.29	13.91	24.08	$125.28